I N D E X

---oOo---

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1985 8:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

---oOo---

MODERATOR McGRATH: Good morning. This has been an interesting morning. We have currently about six or seven agendas going on, and we have my agenda. Let's start with my agenda, and then we will work into everybody else's. How does that sound?

What I'd like to do now, and I don't have it, but there is a group of proposed guidelines that we'd like to have a little bit of discussion on before we go sailing. We can think about it and discuss it more when we come back. So I'd like to, at the speaker's discretion, ask Randy Biallas -- and let me introduce these people and tell you who they are. Randy Biallas is the Assistant to the Chief Architect of the National Park Service. He is really the individual who put together National Park Service cultural resource policy, NPS 28. It's a good document. It's being revised right now. It's a workable document. It has about two or three paragraphs on maritime cultural policy.

Parks Canada, I haven't seen their policy, but I am sure they're going through the same or similar problems. Randy, if you'd come up on the panel, please. Right up here. You're not being set up,

believe me.

Gary Hume is also with the National Park Service. He was a co-author for the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation. He's an architect by training. Here again, here is an individual that knows how to write guidelines to assist preservation. Gary, if you'd come up.

Dana Hewson, director of the shipyard museum at Mystic. Dana, do you think you could come up here.

I would like to ask Glennie Wall to come up. Hyman is getting nervous.

[Laughter]

MODERATOR McGRATH: Mr. Brink, would you like to come up. David Brink from White Elephant Management. And Peter Neill, the director of the South Street Seaport Museum.

What I would like to do is absolutely step back and turn over the show to all of you. Talk to your heart's content for the next 45 minutes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Steve would like to be on the panel.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Steve is our scribe. Steve, would you come up here and get your pencil.

I'd like to take a moment just to give a little brief background, and the background probably

begins somewhere two and a half years ago as the National Trust, at the strong suggestion from the 1981 conference in Baltimore, from the floor, proceeded to develop a task force for maritime preservation to look at the needs, the priorities, and to develop a five-year plan for maritime preservation.

To that end, a committee of about 18 people, representing different aspects and different geographical locations of maritime preservation, came to Washington and began a process of meetings to begin to develop that agenda.

One of the subcommittees, and there were three of them, as I recall -- economic and politics, education preservation, and, thirdly, standards -- that standards subcommittee, working over a period of about two and a half years, came up with a number of suggestions for standards.

That is, A, that we get into the business of standards and guidelines, that we begin to develop them; that, B, there were a number of standards and/or guidelines that existed in the field, such as sail training, association, and a number of others, and that those be adopted so we weren't reinventing the wheel. And that this process was going to have to involve a degree of professionalism, and that indicated that

people were going to have to get paid to do a lot of very difficult and laborious work to develop meaningful and in-depth guidelines and standards.

This process was furthered by the introduction from the Senate Appropriations Committee of the Interior, and I presume all of you are familiar with it -- we read it the other day -- and it basically says that the committee directs the Service, in cooperation with the maritime preservation community and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to, one, conduct a survey of historic maritime resources, including those of the Service; two, recommend standards and priorities for the preservation of those resources; and, three, recommend the appropriate federal and private sector roles in addressing those priorities.

This was, in essence, a mandate. And to put it very cleanly and clearly, it was: Maritime preservation, get it together, figure out what is important and figure out what your standards are. And if you do that, we may be more receptive to helping you fund some of these very large projects that we all know need help.

In that role, of course, it was very important that NPS have some help and support, because, as we

have seen a number of these vessels here, they have a big chunk of what we are talking about -- not the whole chunk, but a big chunk. And in conjunction with the National Trust Task Force, they needed the support to be able get the process underway.

Hence, this conference. This is not only a training session for us to share ideas, talk about projects and different aspects of them, but it's also hopefully to come to some conclusions as a beginning -- a beginning -- to address this process. So, hopefully -- and yesterday, instead of taking the tour of the O'Brien, which we have done before, in a conversation between Peter Neill and Gary, which I happened to eavesdrop in, we decided, well, why not start with the existing guidelines that were already in place for structures and let's play the simple little game of crossing words out like "site" and "building" and start inserting things like "vessel." That is what we gave you yesterday a draft of.

Of course, all of you stayed up late last night working on this, so we should be able to entertain some discussion on each of these points. Notice that there are only ten of them. We didn't go through the whole process. We were just trying to have a beginning point both for discussion and also so that

the Park Service and the Trust can go back to these Congressional committees and say: "We have started the process. We are making progress on it. We care about it. We understand what you are saying. We need some more time, because this isn't a quick process, but this is the beginning."

So, with that in mind, I would like to, over approximately the next half hour, 40 minutes, go through this and see if we can refine this another step further. We will then put it back on the computer, update that, go sailing, come back from sailing, give you the new copy, ask you at your leisure, at least in the five or ten minutes of it, to review that again, come into our final session this afternoon, have another discussion on this topic, and see if we can reach a consensus as a beginning point for standards and guidelines that relate to maritime preservation; agree on that and have that document be a result of this meeting.

Does everybody appreciate that? Ready to do it? With that in mind, I'd like to first ask Gary if he would make a comment, an introductory comment on what we have done here. There's a little hidden agenda, because I know he said he's already revised it.

[Laughter].

MR. GARY HUME: Thank you. I do think it's a very good beginning. I think it's a good first step.

I looked at these and I went over them yesterday and looked at them again last night. And right now my feeling is that probably what we need is not one set of standards for maritime preservation, but I think we actually need three sets of standards. Because it seemed to me -- and again, I am kind of woefully naive about vessels -- but it seemed to me that everything that we have been talking about in the last few days could basically fall into three categories. We are either talking about rehabilitating a vessel, which means either doing something -- intervening in that vessel to continue that use or to find a new use for it, or we are talking about taking something and preserving it just as it is, or we are talking about taking a vessel and trying to restore it to a particular moment in time, such as the submarine we were on yesterday, which would be restoration.

So, when I looked at it, I thought we would probably need three sets of standards, one for rehabilitation, one for restoration, and one for preservation. I think what we've got right here is one-third of that pie, if you will. We've got the first draft of something that would deal with

wanted to make is: In the built environment, we came up with seven treatments. I don't know why. It is just that that is the way it seemed to break out. That seemed to cover all the things that we were both mandated by Congress to do and that seemed to deal with the architectural profession and the building profession. However, in all of the -- well, in six of those seven treatments. One is acquisition. That doesn't really apply. But in six of those seven treatments, the first eight standards are the same. And I would see that same sort of thing, that standards are a basic philosophical groundwork for approaching a cultural resource. So, I would think that that same sort of thing could apply in the maritime community.

MR. PETER NEILL: That is what this represents. Our first eight are the same.

MR. GARY HUME: So, what I am saying in my suggestion that there be three is that we are really talking about what we do after we get through the first eight.

MR. MARK TANAKA-SANDERS: On the first session of the first day of the workshop or class, it was mentioned that we are where the building people were 10 or 20 years ago. When you look at the title of this course, Defining Standards for Preservation and

Restoration of Large Museum Ships, we are at the point where we haven't even defined yet what that is. Large museum ships I don't think is a term that even fits the variety of things that we are doing in here. We run the gamut from museum ships that are structures used for museums that have exhibits in them, to sailing vessels where we are trying to preserve the traditions and skills, to ships that have exhibits and are also used to exhibit the ship itself, or the ship is the exhibit. There is so much variety, as there is in building and archaeological sites and coastal fortifications, that to put one list of things that we have to do to meet all those different criteria is asking for too much -- where we have the basic standards, as we do for buildings, that is fine. But then are going to need to have some classifications or some categories for the different kinds of uses and purposes for which you're restoring or preserving or reconstructing or whatever.

When we get that terminology down, I think we will have a lot of this out of the way, once we agree on that. I don't think we should set up a whole different system either, because we need, as it was mentioned the first day, we are too small of a community to stick to ourselves and set up a cofferdam

around our own individual projects. We need the historic preservationists. They are the historic architects. We need the curators. We need the sailors. We need all these people together and not reinvent the whole thing, but use that experience they have gotten in archaeological sites and the processes they have come up with and to put those to work.

We are into two other courses parallel to ours, in concrete and historic paints. Some of our ships have concrete on them, a lot of them have paint on them. We need those people involved in what we are doing. To set up a whole different system and say that ships are totally different, we are finding the same things that the building people found: the buildings swell, they hog, they bend, they rust, they fall apart. And the ships are doing the same thing.

So, that terminology is going to be very important to get down on paper and maybe as a preface or an appendix to your ten points so that we are talking the same language that the building people are talking about, the archeologists are talking about.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Yes.

MR. STRAFFORD MORSS: Strafford Morss, Battleship Massachusetts. In my other life, which is nuclear quality assurance, my guiding document is 10

I N D E X

---o0o---

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1985 8:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

---oOo---

MODERATOR McGRATH: Good morning. This has been an interesting morning. We have currently about six or seven agendas going on, and we have my agenda. Let's start with my agenda, and then we will work into everybody else's. How does that sound?

What I'd like to do now, and I don't have it, but there is a group of proposed guidelines that we'd like to have a little bit of discussion on before we go sailing. We can think about it and discuss it more when we come back. So I'd like to, at the speaker's discretion, ask Randy Biallas -- and let me introduce these people and tell you who they are. Randy Biallas is the Assistant to the Chief Architect of the National Park Service. He is really the individual who put together National Park Service cultural resource policy, NPS 28. It's a good document. It's being revised right now. It's a workable document. It has about two or three paragraphs on maritime cultural policy.

Parks Canada, I haven't seen their policy, but I am sure they're going through the same or similar problems. Randy, if you'd come up on the panel, please. Right up here. You're not being set up,

believe me.

Gary Hume is also with the National Park Service. He was a co-author for the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation. He's an architect by training. Here again, here is an individual that knows how to write guidelines to assist preservation. Gary, if you'd come up.

Dana Hewson, director of the shipyard museum at Mystic. Dana, do you think you could come up here.

I would like to ask Glennie Wall to come up. Hyman is getting nervous.

[Laughter]

MODERATOR McGRATH: Mr. Brink, would you like to come up. David Brink from White Elephant Management. And Peter Neill, the director of the South Street Seaport Museum.

What I would like to do is absolutely step back and turn over the show to all of you. Talk to your heart's content for the next 45 minutes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Steve would like to be on the panel.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Steve is our scribe. Steve, would you come up here and get your pencil.

I'd like to take a moment just to give a little brief background, and the background probably

begins somewhere two and a half years ago as the National Trust, at the strong suggestion from the 1981 conference in Baltimore, from the floor, proceeded to develop a task force for maritime preservation to look at the needs, the priorities, and to develop a five-year plan for maritime preservation.

To that end, a committee of about 18 people, representing different aspects and different geographical locations of maritime preservation, came to Washington and began a process of meetings to begin to develop that agenda.

One of the subcommittees, and there were three of them, as I recall -- economic and politics, education preservation, and, thirdly, standards -- that standards subcommittee, working over a period of about two and a half years, came up with a number of suggestions for standards.

That is, A, that we get into the business of standards and guidelines, that we begin to develop them; that, B, there were a number of standards and/or guidelines that existed in the field, such as sail training, association, and a number of others, and that those be adopted so we weren't reinventing the wheel. And that this process was going to have to involve a degree of professionalism, and that indicated that

people were going to have to get paid to do a lot of very difficult and laborious work to develop meaningful and in-depth guidelines and standards.

This process was furthered by the introduction from the Senate Appropriations Committee of the Interior, and I presume all of you are familiar with it -- we read it the other day -- and it basically says that the committee directs the Service, in cooperation with the maritime preservation community and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to, one, conduct a survey of historic maritime resources, including those of the Service; two, recommend standards and priorities for the preservation of those resources; and, three, recommend the appropriate federal and private sector roles in addressing those priorities.

This was, in essence, a mandate. And to put it very cleanly and clearly, it was: Maritime preservation, get it together, figure out what is important and figure out what your standards are. And if you do that, we may be more receptive to helping you fund some of these very large projects that we all know need help.

In that role, of course, it was very important that NPS have some help and support, because, as we

have seen a number of these vessels here, they have a big chunk of what we are talking about -- not the whole chunk, but a big chunk. And in conjunction with the National Trust Task Force, they needed the support to be able get the process underway.

Hence, this conference. This is not only a training session for us to share ideas, talk about projects and different aspects of them, but it's also hopefully to come to some conclusions as a beginning -- a beginning -- to address this process. So, hopefully -- and yesterday, instead of taking the tour of the O'Brien, which we have done before, in a conversation between Peter Neill and Gary, which I happened to eavesdrop in, we decided, well, why not start with the existing guidelines that were already in place for structures and let's play the simple little game of crossing words out like "site" and "building" and start inserting things like "vessel." That is what we gave you yesterday a draft of.

Of course, all of you stayed up late last night working on this, so we should be able to entertain some discussion on each of these points. Notice that there are only ten of them. We didn't go through the whole process. We were just trying to have a beginning point both for discussion and also so that

the Park Service and the Trust can go back to these Congressional committees and say: "We have started the process. We are making progress on it. We care about it. We understand what you are saying. We need some more time, because this isn't a quick process, but this is the beginning."

So, with that in mind, I would like to, over approximately the next half hour, 40 minutes, go through this and see if we can refine this another step further. We will then put it back on the computer, update that, go sailing, come back from sailing, give you the new copy, ask you at your leisure, at least in the five or ten minutes of it, to review that again, come into our final session this afternoon, have another discussion on this topic, and see if we can reach a consensus as a beginning point for standards and guidelines that relate to maritime preservation; agree on that and have that document be a result of this meeting.

Does everybody appreciate that? Ready to do it? With that in mind, I'd like to first ask Gary if he would make a comment, an introductory comment on what we have done here. There's a little hidden agenda, because I know he said he's already revised it.

[Laughter].

MR. GARY HUME: Thank you. I do think it's a very good beginning. I think it's a good first step.

I looked at these and I went over them yesterday and looked at them again last night. And right now my feeling is that probably what we need is not one set of standards for maritime preservation, but I think we actually need three sets of standards. Because it seemed to me -- and again, I am kind of woefully naive about vessels -- but it seemed to me that everything that we have been talking about in the last few days could basically fall into three categories. We are either talking about rehabilitating a vessel, which means either doing something -- intervening in that vessel to continue that use or to find a new use for it, or we are talking about taking something and preserving it just as it is, or we are talking about taking a vessel and trying to restore it to a particular moment in time, such as the submarine we were on yesterday, which would be restoration.

So, when I looked at it, I thought we would probably need three sets of standards, one for rehabilitation, one for restoration, and one for preservation. I think what we've got right here is one-third of that pie, if you will. We've got the first draft of something that would deal with

CFR 50, Appendix B, set up by public law and codified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. That provides the basic framework for volumes and volumes and layers and layers of interpretations. I think the standards that we are looking for here are the equivalent of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B.

I think that the various communities will have sublayers, how these standards are applied to them -- the community of the National Park Service vessels, the community of the vessels on loan from the United States Navy, the community of the privately owned historic vessels such as the Mystic Seaport operates and South Street Seaport and whatever.

But I think if we keep that in mind, that these basic standards can be applied and interpreted somewhat differently towards the needs of the applicable community, we will all be a whole lot happier as we consider them.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I wanted, on top of those two points, to interject: Let's remember that we are probably talking, before we get done with this process, of two to three, at least, years' worth of work. So, we are talking about first blush here. I think both Mark's and Strafford's comments relate to that, and I think it's important to keep that in mind.

Peter Neill.

MR. PETER NEILL: A quick, also, response. Please look in your books, because you will find a review of extant standards that pertain to aspects of our various enterprises. And the one thing we really don't want to do is to reinvent the wheel, so that the AAM standards or the American Sailing, Sailing School Vessel Council standards, or the Camp Federation Standards or the National Education Association standards -- all of these things were investigated and adapted and evaluated in terms of their adaptation to maritime uses.

So I don't think any of us are suggesting that we try to go and do work that doesn't necessarily need to be done.

MR. TOM McGRATH: I went back and tried to pull out the Parks Canada National Marine Parks draft policy. I showed it to Herb Stovel. It is a third draft, August 1983.

I would like to put the charge to our Canadian colleagues. Is there an updated policy -- this policy talks really about underwater or marine environment parks. If you could share with us, so we don't reinvent the wheel, whatever policy that you have in Canada, such as this, that relates to ships, and if you

can bring it by the mail to us, we then can truly achieve a North American maritime policy.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: Just to follow up on a comment about definition of what a large museum ship is. We use right now, and this is very much subject to change, for nautical vessel, a water craft over 20 feet long and bearing the designation of boat, are ordinarily considered nautical vessels. All ocean-going ships are considered nautical vessels. Any craft that can be rowed or paddled, even if such is not its primary means of power, is a boat rather than a nautical vessel. Nautical vessels are treated as structures, historic structures, when we say the Secretary's standards apply, for purposes of preservation. Other water craft are treated as museum objects.

For what it's worth.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Steve.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: I just have a suggestion for a title change for this. Rather than "Preservation of Historic Vessels," "Maintenance of Historic Vessels."

MR. DAVID BRINK: In the big sense?

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: Yes. In the sense of holding them. The problem is not only initial

treatment but --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Might that not be maintaining them?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: Management. "Maintenance" has some pretty -- it is clearly defined in the National Park Service, and we would have problems --

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: Okay. But perhaps in the sense of maintaining rather than an initial treatment.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: The other thing is, you were suggesting three levels of treatment. You were; Gary was. And I really think maybe you should consider two additional levels or some additional ideas, at least. One is maintenance. "Preservation maintenance," we say right now on the Park side. Another is reconstruction. Walter discussed the need for reconstructions yesterday. And we do actually do recognize that as a treatment. Another is stabilization, which is sort of a subset of preservation, preserving what you have when you acquire it. And we do have standards for all of those right now.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Pete Neill had a comment.

MR. PETER NEILL: Well, I think that actually we are on the right track. We have in the litany that

I have discussed in my little presentation -- is one that has been discussed by a lot of maritime folks before, and we do have documentation, stabilization/maintenance, rehabilitation or reconstruction, interpretation -- because we have talked about that all day long, all conference long, and we don't want to forget it, and, finally, the replication. That might be a useful one. There seem to be some overlaps in definitions there, because you document the buildings. They are standards for documentation of structures as well, are they not?

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: Yes. You heard a presentation the other night on the HAER standards, and they are really very detailed.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I would like to make a suggestion, that in subcommittee we work out an introductory paragraph that we will submit back to you. I will charge Peter, within that subcommittee process, working with Randy, to develop those concepts that he just mentioned, the five concepts, and work those in.

Now I would like to suggest that, just at the level we are at, that we try and run through ten different points and see if anyone can poke any relevant holes in these simple little statements that we have made. I would like to take No. 1 now, "Every

reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a vessel which requires minimal alteration of its structure and appearance," and ask for comment.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: This is that language that's got to be written in, is it? The whole thing is very, very vague. We are talking about suggestions, reasonable efforts, and things like that.

If this is the language that's got to be, it's what it's got to be, but some people are going to take a look at this say, "Okay, that's fine, but we need to do this and we need to do this."

There are no teeth in it. Can there be, or is this the way it's got to be?

MR. DAVID BRINK: It doesn't have to be anything. In other words, it is what we are suggesting. So I suggest that you turn that around and make a suggestion, if you would, John. If you don't like it, say what you don't like.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: Well, the vagueness of it, the very vagueness.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: This was an adaptation of the existing standards for structures, and we stuck with the same wording when we were going through that.

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: I like the vagueness. Most of all, it's not something that says "You have to

do it." It's a guideline. One of the things we discussed yesterday was changing the word "standards" to "guidelines." That is all it is, to provide you a sense of direction -- when you have a decision to make, provide you a sense of direction that you're supposed to take in this decision in order to use these guidelines. It's not something that says that if you don't do it, here comes the state police who's going to take your ship away from you. It's not intended to be that. That is why I think the vagueness is important and therefore more applicable to many more different situations.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Gary.

MR. GARY HUME: I would just comment that when we did the standards for the built environment, for the land environment, that we tried to make them broad, philosophical statements so that there could be interpretation, they could be applied to everything from adobe huts to grand-style buildings.

Suprisingly, they work fairly well. They have actually been tested in court and withstood the test in court. So, I understand that problem. They do seem vague at the beginning, but they do seem to work fairly well in that general broad-brush approach.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We've got five questions.

Yes.

MR. RICHARD ANDERSON: Correct me if I am wrong, Gary, but I think the vagueness that he is worried about really is that things get crystallized more as to begin to deal with specific aspects of preservation, the seven or eight areas you mentioned and so forth. That's where you begin to get it cleared up.

MR. GARY HUME: Right. Actually what we saw, the way we did it was that the standards were this umbrella from which a whole raft of things came down. There would then be guidelines and there were preservation briefs and then there were reports, and there were all these other things that then become very specific.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I would just like to point out that there are a number of cases, John, where we chose to mandate, almost, like No. 6, "All vessels 'shall' be subject to a program of preventive maintenance." So, there are areas where it's taken on more of a mandate.

MR. DAVID BRINK: David.

MR. DAVID WALKER: I feel that vagueness should be, is almost an asset. "Vagueness" perhaps isn't the right word. But this umbrella idea, it gives

latitude. I wanted to confirm that I feel that way about it. If you get too specific in specifications, the contractor is looking for why you were so specific, and you get into trouble. I think that if you color it very, very generally and guide these people, whoever they may be, then we are going to achieve -- go back to the whole book of architectural standards.

MR. STRAFFORD MORSS: One of the things I think is underlying from a number of the private groups attending the conference here was the thought that was brought up very early on, that these proposed standards, as opposed to a guideline, might be used as part of the evaluative process for the availability of later federal funding.

So, if that is perhaps going to be the case, at least for the United States vessels, vessels in the Continental United States, the generality, I think, is very good, but then there has to be, as I said, the tiered level of detailed interpretation for the type of vessel you are going with.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I'd just like to add a footnote to that. Not only money, which comes and goes in the federal system, but also a sense of approval -- that is, if a vessel is rated up here at the top of its type, that approval by this system can be very

important for private fund-raising.

Peter.

MR. PETER STEELE: I think we need a little clarification concerning the resources with which we are dealing or attempting to deal with the standards. I noticed that the Standard 7, as written in the draft here, deals with archeological resources, but it is not clear where artifacts fall into this and whether they should just be in the title or in the introduction or whether each standard has to mention maritime artifacts, sites, or whatever, or if they may be handled in one particular phrase. We need to determine whether all the standards would apply to artifacts and sites or not.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Good point. Randy.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: I would just follow up on that. When you get into artifacts or museum objects, you're into a whole other discipline that has existing standards already for treatment of those things, and I don't know why you would even want to start to deal with them.

I think the main problem is the ships, right? Not the artifacts.

MR. PETER STEELE: I think we are charged by Congress with responding, establishing the suggested

standards for maritime resources.

MR. DAVID BRINK: That is true. And also into that, which I think is really what Randy's point is, we can also use all kinds of existing structures and so forth to apply that.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: I don't think you want to try and get one standard or a series of standards for all these different potential kinds of resources, because you could be dealing with museum objects, you could be dealing with documentary source material. Like we saw yesterday, you could be doing library material. And, obviously, it is going to be very difficult to write a standard that is applicable to all those different kinds. You could also be dealing with lighthouses and things like that.

MR. PETER STEELE: Peter Steele again. It may be that we can refer to existing standards.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: Exactly.

MR. PETER NEILL: That is the point. I think we want to make sure, given the current climate and the new discoveries that we are confronted with every day, not only outside of vessels but inside vessels -- that in reconstructions, we are finding artifacts in the bilges, et cetera. And just a general reference to the word "archeology" that allows us -- that is a bell

word. And I think that, again, it's general here so that when you have an artifact, it falls over into the AAM criteria or whatever it might be.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I just want to make sure Strafford gets some guidelines to save that propeller he's thrown away.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I'd like to go back, if we could, to No. 1. Does anyone vehemently object to the principle laid out in No. 1?

MR. STEPHEN HASTINGS: My only comment on No. 1 is: That does not address the impact of use on the vessels, stability, the act of stabilizing vis-a-vis the preventive maintenance at a later date needs to be addressed as anyone is looking at using those vessels.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I think that comes out in the different aspects that we were talking about. And it comes up later. Thank you.

Stephen.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: The only possible problem I could see with No. 1 is in the case of considerable restoration. You know, you might want to do more than minimal alteration initially.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Would you clarify that.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: You want to provide --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Give us an example.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: -- used for the vessel as it is developed by the end of the initial project. In other words, we don't want to commit ourselves to indicating that if a vessel in its current necessarily --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Stephen, if I am understanding you right, I think that gets addressed in the sense of what we are really advocating here, is figure out the end -- what Walter was talking about before -- what's the end result of the project. How are you going to use it? How is it either going to make money or take care of itself or be supported? And then work backward in your planning process.

And hopefully, then applying the other guidelines, you would find out what alterations were appropriate, what period you were addressing, and so forth. I hope that would take care of it.

MR. GARY HUME: Let me suggest one word that may address that. Why don't we change it and say: Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a vessel which requires minimal alteration of its historic structure and appearance.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Fair enough.

FROM THE FLOOR: That is good.

MR. GARY HUME: Because if it has accretions,

it certainly may go.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Good. Any more comment about No. 1? No. 2.

"The distinguishing original qualities or character of a vessel shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive features shall be avoided."

Comment.

MR. JIM DELGADO: I still want something a little more specific about preserving original material, as we talked about before, perhaps some sort of statement that indicates that if a decision is made to no longer maintain a vessel through constant repair and maintenance but, rather, to stabilize her, that original material in those instances shall be preserved, but -- that is, original fabric -- and archaeologically recovered vessels have their fabric retained. I think the time has come for no more vasa's where you're actually rebuilding or replacing timber in an archaeologically recovered vessel, things of that sort. I'd like to see that overtly stated. I see the intent here. I just want it stated more specifically.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I think, again, as we said before when we were having general comment, you may find that the strength you're looking for is going to

come out, as Strafford said, in those subset sections. When you get into underwater archeology, I am sure you are going to have at least six or eight feet worth of that kind of documentation.

I think, in the general sense, you may get a little bit more if there is more consensus here, but I don't think you are going to find the depth that you are looking for in this kind of a guideline. I think that is going to have to come subsequently.

Comments?

MR. PETER NEILL: Jim, has that issue been resolved by the archeological community? I mean, it seems to me that right now it's a subject of some debate, and for us to declare one way or another seems a bit . . .

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I think basically when we study vessels archeologically, we have specific things that we are looking for. And we feel rather strangely about the anthropologic significance of original fabric -- that is, tool marks on timbers, builder's markings, things of that sort, mistakes made in the construction of the vessel, indications of excellent or sloppy craftsmanship being reflective of the behavior of the builder, that sort of thing.

So, I don't think that that is subject to

debate at all, Peter. All of us in the maritime archaeological community recognize that.

What you may be thinking of is in terms of those people who don't care about those humanistic concerns and go out and rob wrecks for treasures, which the scientific archeologic community feels very strongly about.

MR. PETER NEILL: Would it address the issue if we made this a positive statement instead of a negative statement and said, "The distinguishing original qualities or character of a vessel shall be sustained or protected. Removal or alteration of any historic material shall be avoided"? Does that make it a stronger statement?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Gary, did you have a comment?

MR. GARY HUME: I was just wondering if Jim's concerns aren't maybe more properly addressed under No. 5, and he may want to suggest some language there.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I think it sort of falls between 2 and 5 there. Like I said, the intent is there.

I think No. 5 is pretty much fine as it stands. I guess I was looking for something more overt that actually came up with specific guidelines and said

that -- there are obviously large museum ships that do exist that we have to deal with that are either on land or in museums, and I just wanted some sort of a guideline to indicate that those archeologically recovered vessels would not be subject to alteration. I see that you have got it in here.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I am going to cut you off, if I can. I have just been given the cue that we have ten minutes. Now, in ten minutes we are not going to get through all of this. But let's see what we can do by really being relevant to the point. If we are rushing too much, we will save one minute to figure out how we're going to deal with it.

MODERATOR McGRATH: Talk about it on the boat, under sail.

MR. DAVID BRINK: First of all, you don't have your recording process. This is really something that needs to be recorded. But we will work it out somehow or another, how we continue the discussion.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I do want this in the proceedings.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Right. I think we are all agreed about that.

We are taking the suggestion that No. 2 be changed to a positive. If there is no further comment

on No. 2, I want to move to No. 3.

MR. DANA HEWSON: No. 2, if you make No. 2 too strong a statement, it's going to put just about anything out of business. That is the one that you're saying -- I mean, if you change it too much, it's going to eliminate everything, or everything is just not going to have anything to do with the standards anymore.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Why not have a specific guideline that deals with those special cases?

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Such as?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Such as --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Excuse me. Peter Neill has a suggested rephrasement.

MR. PETER NEILL: "Distinguishing original fabric qualities or character of the vessel shall be preserved whenever possible. Removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive features shall be avoided."

MS. GLENNIE WALL: That sounds good.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: A word alteration that might go for 2 and 5. If removed, to be preserved, if possible. If a figurehead has to be taken off because of dry rot and a new figurehead put on, take that figurehead, put it in a museum, stabilize it with the

technology, conservation technology you have, and there you are.

MR. DAVID BRINK: And put it next to the stuff Strafford threw away?

[Laughter]

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: That is fine. I agree with the statement. But I would have a stack of catheads about yea high for the Constitution right now.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We have been trying to get those in Galveston for years.

[Laughter]

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: But there comes a point in time where you just really can't keep it all anymore.

FROM THE FLOOR: Representative samples.

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: That is fine. I don't have any problem with that.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Point accepted.

MR. GARY HUME: Where appropriate.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Moving to No. 3.

"All vessels shall be recognized as products of an historic period. Alterations that have no historical basis relevant to that period shall be discouraged."

Comment, please.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: What about working sailing vessels? The fact is that most people who go in sail training, the first ship they come across is a historic ship, and they want to use that one. What about when they strip, when they fill the fishhold full of bunks? Will that hold? Will this guideline hold then?

MR. GARY HUME: Well, I would suggest one change that makes it a little broader. I would say that all vessels shall be recognized as products of their own time, which gives it a little more than strictly a historical context.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Could you define for us -- we had a little problem with that. What the hell does that mean vis-a-vis a particular period? What we were saying was, what seems to be true in many things that we are aware of is a ship goes through changes, you have almost got to say the most significant historic period that we are going to restore the ship to is this one versus her own time. Her own time --

MR. GARY HUME: "Her own time" is her life as a continuum.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay.

MR. PETER NEILL: That is more poetic.

[Laughter]

FROM THE FLOOR: Apropos to the last

statement, aren't we dealing with ships mostly in this conference that are going to be sitting at a dock being walked on as the traditional museum ship? Sail training people really have a whole lot of other things to worry about. They're going to be bringing aboard modern life preservers, life rafts, all kinds of stuff that we are not going to be worrying about with exhibit vessels.

Let's kind of keep this to things that deal with exhibits and museums. There is too wide a scope of historic vessels to be worrying about that part of it.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Ted, I think No. 4 addresses the change.

Yes. You have a comment. The front row.

MR. JOHN CONWAY: How about if we added -- where was it?

MR. DAVID BRINK: No. 3?

MR. JOHN CONWAY: We're on No. 3. Okay. Permanent alterations, alterations that cannot be changed back to the original structure.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Look at No. 8.

MR. PETER NEILL: If you read them all through, it might help.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We have five minutes to go.

Are there any more comments on No. 3? On we have taken the suggestion that Gary made for our notes. Any more comment on No. 3?

No. 4.

"Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and the development of a vessel. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected."

Any comment?

MR. PETER NEILL: This is what addresses the fishhold bunk issue. Over time, the use of the vessel has changed, and it allows it to have a legitimate -- to legitimize those changes.

MR. DAVID WALKER: I interpret that to mean, you started off with your ship, and you've added other things to it. The original owners have added and changed and added and changed, subtracted, so that the original ship is almost lost. This indicates to me that we are going to try and preserve all these different time period alterations.

Shouldn't there be a judgment call here?

MR. DAVID BRINK: I think it is a judgment call as to where you're looking at the boat, what period of time you're restoring it to, and what changes

are relevant to that time.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Changes relevant to historical significance, historically significant in context, perhaps?

MR. DAVID BRINK: The appropriate context, right.

We've got four minutes. Strafford.

MR. STRAFFORD MORSS: Just very briefly. On the last line of Standard 4, I think if you change "this significant shall be recognized" to "this significance 'may be' recognized," it allows you to pick the point in time or the era.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay. So noted. Any other comments? Yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: No. 4, changes which may have taken place during its working "life" rather than "in the course of time." Would that be more specific?

MR. DAVID BRINK: We will look at that.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Please identify yourself.

MR. RICHARD ANDERSON: I think the word here, "These changes may have acquired significance" -- it doesn't say all changes are significant.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Good point. No. 5.

"Distinctive features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a vessel -- its

construction, operation, and cultural context -- shall be treated with sensitivity."

Jim.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Great.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Anyone else?

MR. MARK HERTIG: What Jim brought up earlier about mistakes, I think is critical, might even be worth noting in the sense that you get a key word here that says "skilled." In learning about a vessel's history, the mistakes are as important as what most people would think are the more skilled and --

MR. DAVID BRINK: So noted.

MR. PETER NEILL: No, they're not. Let's not make any more mistakes.

[Laughter]

MR. JOHN CONWAY: We came upon this. I am shipwright apprentice, and mistakes in a historical vessel, when you come upon a mistake and it endangers the vessel in the way perhaps of maybe allowing rot to get into a structure more easily, I don't think that mistake should be reproduced exactly.

MR. JIM DELGADO: I think by "sensitive treatment" we mean documentation.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Yes. Any other? No. 6.

MR. DANA HEWSON: I think besides skill, I

think you might want to make sort of room for the fact that some boats weren't built with as much skill as others. And all these collections have examples of that. The Seaport has the Dunton, which was built really fast; the Morgan, which was built really fast, and was built to a much, much higher standard. And when they're rebuilt, they should reflect that standard. I mean, the the Dunton shouldn't look like the Morgan.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Point well taken. Steve.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I have often said that the essence of craftsmanship is covering your mistakes.

[Laughter]

FROM THE FLOOR: It's our boat.

[Laughter]

MR. PETER NEILL: Don't debate.

MR. DAVID BRINK: No. 6. Are we ready?

"All vessels shall be subject to a program of preventive maintenance. Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material shall be replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other qualities appropriate to the vessel's determined use. Repair or replacement of missing features shall be based on accurate

duplications, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence."

MR. GARY HUME: I think it's good. I would make one change in the second sentence. I would say, "In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material shall be replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other qualities" -- now the change -- "that maintain the historic character of the vessel."

I would put the emphasis on "the character of the vessel" rather than the use.

MR. PETER NEILL: That should be discussed.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Peter thinks that should be talked about.

MR. PETER NEILL: I think that if you have a historic vessel and then she needs to go sailing and you've decided that that is the way you are going to sustain her and you have changed her from a museum ship to a sailing ship, that doesn't work. And so what this does is, it allows you to make a replacement that would be stronger.

MR. GARY HUME: It would be still be within the historic character. What I am worried about is the ferryboat that becomes a restaurant and the new use wags the dog.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Walter Rybka.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think Gary's suggestion doesn't preclude the idea of making replacements when you need to. I think it's acceptable as a philosophical position. I think honoring the importance of historic fabric is something we can all agree on. The more I think about this, and we have been arguing about this for days and days and days in terms of retention of historic fabric and doing preservation. And I kind of had a complete reversal in my own mind just sort of sitting here this morning. I realize we don't have to argue about it, because as long as people accept, A, you want to retain historic fabric, B, occasionally you can't. Then it's just a matter of interpretation.

MR. DAVID BRINK: A judgment call.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: A judgment call. And what might happen is, in the case of a building, maybe it's ten percent of the time you have to replace something, and in the case of a ship, it's probably going to be 40 or 50 percent of the time. If it's accepted that we are trying to preserve it and do the best possible thing by the ship, we will apply these guidelines. It means that if you want to replace historic fabric, you have to demonstrate a good reason to do that -- if you

have a survey, if you have an engineering study -- the logic for it will be inexorable, still it doesn't change the philosophy.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay. Good point.

Any other questions on the No. 6? No. 7.

"Every reasonable effort shall be made to document, protect, and preserve archaeological resources affected by the preservation of the vessel."

Looks like Jim has something to say.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Archeological resources implies to a lot of people something different than what I think you're trying to get to here. I think you may want to talk about preserving of physical remains or physical traces --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Is it the terminology, the word "archeological"?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: "Archeological resources," I know what you are trying to say.

MR. DAVID BRINK: What would you suggest?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Physical, original features or physical traces or remnants -- I can't quite think of the proper term.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Would you put --

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Artifacts and objects, it gets down into museum -- we are talking --

MR. STEVE HYMAN: We are also talking china in the bilge --

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Right. You are talking about remnants, original chain plates, what Walter referred to as archeological evidence with Elissa. That is what you are getting at here, I think.

MR. DAVID BRINK: "Historical evidence"?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: That might be fine, but archeological resources indicates shipwreck.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Steve, would you please note all these. Could we hear those suggestions again, the different ones.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Evidence, physical evidence, physical remnants, traces.

MODERATOR McGRATH: Anthropological?

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: No. I think that is evidence.

FROM THE FLOOR: Archaeological implies scientific recovery, as does anthropology. That is not what we are dealing with. We are dealing with physical evidence, objects, and so on. So, I think Jim is right -- evidence, physical evidence.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Evidence, physical evidence. All right.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: I would suggest we need a wider comment on the need for documentation, documentation not only of original evidence but of changes and alterations, new material. I think it's essential --

MR. DAVID BRINK: It's like a continuum -- in other words, not just a process, but throughout the life of the vessel, you're taking about?

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: Yes.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: You need to document the evolution of the vessel.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Document the evolution of the vessel.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: The reasons for the decision being made initially and ongoing.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Thoroughly if not exhaustively researched.

MR. STEPHEN HASTINGS: That documentation has to extend into the work that is being done today in preservation -- it's implied. But I agree, archaeological resources isn't just it. If you were a true preservationist, you would go so far as stamping the date on the back of members that required replacement so that, if sometime in the future, people were coming back and into this area, they would able to

identify what was replaced during its life as a museum vessel.

MR. PETER NEILL: If you were a true preservationist, there would be no future.

[Laughter]

MR. DAVID BRINK: We have just been given another sign. We have a real five minutes. We have three to go. If we can, I'd like to move to No. 8. We have noted the changes on No. 7. No. 8.

"In some cases, alterations to a vessel may be justified by operational necessity. Wherever possible, such alterations shall be done in a manner that, if such alteration is removed, the essential form and integrity of the vessel will be preserved."

This was a point that we discussed earlier. Does anyone have a problem with that?

MR. GARY HUME: Yes. Well, I have a suggestion. I would change the first statement and turn it around. I would say, "Alterations to a vessel shall be undertaken only when such changes do not severely impact the historic character or significance of the vessel."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Anyone, comment?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I agree with Gary. I think it's not only operational. In some cases, it may

be a legal necessity for Coast Guard certification. I don't know if that is implicit or not.

MR. DAVID BRINK: It is noted. Lynn. Peter? Okay. No. 9.

"All preservation efforts shall be preceded by an established plan and budget which affirms and sustains the intended use of the vessel."

Comment?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I have a problem with "use" in there. Management of the vessel. Is that what we decided on?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Management. Anything else? Yes, David.

MR. DAVID WALKER: Would it not be a good criteria to include documentation, perhaps delete it elsewhere?

MR. DAVID BRINK: It may be that what we need to do is include that whole process of documentation, stabilization, planning, et cetera, that whole thing.

MR. DAVID WALKER: Just add that one word.

MR. DAVID BRINK: It is in No. 10. But, Steve, so note that and let's compare that afterward.

Anything else? Yes, Gary.

MR. GARY HUME: David, I think what I would do is try to let an established plan carry it all and not

even be so specific as to say "budget." I'd hate to be shot down because you didn't have a budget right then and there.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We are saying that "plan" is all-encompassing. We will so note that somehow.

Yes, Jim.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: One thought on budget. We in the archeological community support this. You have to have all phases funded before you begin work.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Got it. That was the reason for putting that in. We will discuss that.

Now, just give me a moment of grace here. We got one to go, big fella', and here we go. No. 10.

"All preservation efforts shall conform, when possible, to existing guidelines prepared by recognized professional organizations for documentation, stabilization and maintenance, restoration, and interpretation of cultural resources. The National Park Service, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the maritime preservation community shall continue to develop new guidelines and recommendations specific to the preservation of historic vessels through an inventory and evaluation process, case studies, and conferences devoted to the development of appropriate procedures and priorities

for maritime preservation."

I am sure you don't like the word "preservation."

MR. GARY HUME: I agree with that totally. My only change would be to put that in the introduction rather than one of the specific standards.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Good. Excellent. John.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: And priorities for maritime heritage preservation.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay. Does the last word, "maritime preservation" -- are we back to whatever our -- wasn't there a problem with that, Glennie?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I don't think in this context, no.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We are finished. Thank you very much. We will be back to you in the last session. Before that, we will have revisions of this and we will discuss it as one of the last things today, hoping for a consensus.

---o0o---

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1985 1:30 O'CLOCK P.M.

---o0o---

MODERATOR McGRATH: We are running a little behind schedule. What we'd like to do is begin Session 6, and this session is Standards for Maintenance and Preservation Skills Training.

Our first speaker today is a personal friend of mine, I'd like to think, and an individual that I keep bumping into at the damndest places. Last time was my cousin's wedding. And we had some laughs about that. I was real pleased to hear of his promotion to shipyard director at the Mystic Seaport, Dana Hewson.

[Applause]

MR. DANA HEWSON: I didn't bring any slides because I figured that after a sail on the bay and lunch, if we shut the lights off, that would be pretty much the end of things. So, we are going to leave the lights on. The other thing that I apologize for a little bit before I start is that almost everything that -- not almost everything -- a lot of what I am about to say has been said before this week when we have been discussing different facets of the vessels and their restoration. But I really did write this before I came. It just happens that other people wrote the same thing.

The talk is going to be about standards for maintenance. I think that, first of all, in my mind, maintenance of historic vessels is just about anything short of a restoration. I am not familiar with other people's definitions of maintenance or restoration or some of the other things, but it would certainly include cleaning, painting, replacement of parts, removing machinery, putting machinery back on. There are a lot things that would fall into my definition of maintenance, but there would be a point where maintenance would stop and it would become a restoration.

I think that standards are going to be very, very hard to develop for maintenance work, and if they are able to be developed, it's going to be a while before they are in place. So I thought what I should do would be to just kind of go through the thought process that would be involved in trying to develop a maintenance program for a ship.

One of the problems with standards, and we discussed this this morning, is that they will either be very vague and general or they will so specific that you can't stick by them. There are so many variables involved. Enough of that.

I think, though, that my thoughts would be

that if we were going to have guidelines, they would just cover general things, and then standards have to be developed on a local level. And only someone who is very knowledgeable of the vessel, the organization that is responsible for taking care of the vessel, certainly the finances of the project, that sort of thing can only be developed on a local level, but within certain guidelines.

There are certain areas of vessels that would require different procedures than other areas of the vessel. And again, those places could only be determined on a local level.

I looked up "preserved" in Webster's dictionary, and there were two definitions that apply to us. One was "to keep from harm," and the other was "to carry on or maintain." So preservation, maintenance, by some definitions, it's very similar. But basically what we are trying to do with any maintenance program is to stabilize the condition of the vessel and in many cases improve it somewhat over a period of time. That is either going to be a long period of time or a short period of time, depending on a couple of things. But to avoid wasting time and money on any project, the first step in developing a maintenance program, I feel, would be the accurate

assessment of the condition of the vessel. This can be done with surveys or with the knowledge of people who have been involved with the project over a period of time, a combination of both, one or the other -- it depends on the expertise of the people involved. But somehow, before you do much of anything, you have to know the condition of the vessel.

That is going to bring us to the first major decision, I think, that has to be made and sort of a juncture in the road. We are either going to come up with something that is on the verge of needing a major restoration project, in which case the goal would primarily be to stabilize it. That may include putting a cover over it, putting it in a tent, putting it inside a building. There are a lot of things short of that that can be done to stabilize a vessel without wasting work.

I tend to be a little bit of a traditionalist when it comes to maintenance methods, more so than some people in the room, I think. But in this case, there is a lot of freedom of choice, because the only thing that is trying to be done is to protect the vessel from deteriorating any farther. And like I said, almost any means necessary. In the case of a museum vessel, which I am more familiar with, you can use synthetic

materials. The sky is the limit -- as long as you don't destroy any historical evidence and don't make it a process that is irreversible. But it's just trying to hold the vessel where it is.

I think things that would be very important to consider would be cleanliness, ventilation, the watertight integrity, which could be the roof or the paint or whatever, and appearance. Appearance is kind of funny to talk about perhaps when you're discussing a boat that is on its way to be ripped apart, but I think that just because a boat is in pretty bad shape, it still can be something that people can be proud of. Whatever is done to it, it ought to look good. It ought to be clean, it ought to be ventilated. It shouldn't be damp. I think a lot of care can go into something without wasting money. This is kind of a judgment thing. There are a lot of boats that get worked on, and people think they are doing the right thing. And then when it has to be restored, it gets all torn apart. I think that is something to be avoided. But there is a lot short of that that you can do.

The other side of the assessment would be that you've got a vessel that you don't feel is going to be in need of a major restoration soon. That brings up

another whole set of choices. Because now you have got to start assessing what you've got and a variety of other things.

If the vessel is not in immediate need of restoration work, I guess the second class would be one that has been well maintained over time. That could be an older boat that has just come into a museum or a group that has acquired it, and basically it's in good shape and is going to last for a number of years without tearing the whole thing apart. In part, what has been done in the past is going to determine anything that you'll be able to do in the future on the boat.

Then I think a third and a fourth type would be a boat that's been recently restored or a boat that's been recently built.

At this point, I think I ought to point out that no ship or boat is going to fit into any one class completely. They don't fit into compartments that you can just say, "This is what it is, and this is what we are going to do." There are too many variables involved -- except, I guess, if a boat has just been built. It ought to be in reasonably good shape. But, still, there is going to be extensive work that's going to have to be done in the future. One of the problems

that may have to be faced up to at some point is that some good work that has been done may have to be removed in the future anyway. But that is going to depend on decisions that, again, are farther down the line.

Hopefully, if a vessel has been recently restored or is a new vessel, enough was planned and decided upon before it was finished so that you're not going to have a contradiction in what the vessel was built to do and what you intend to do with it. But I don't think that that is always going to be the case. I think there are always going to be boats that are just not intended for what they're going to be used for.

The next variable which should be discussed, I think, would be type. There are many types of vessels and varying levels of craftsmanship within each type. However, often identifying the type will give us enough to go on as to what we should do for a maintenance program. Sometimes we need to be more specific and deal with the particular vessel. The types that come immediately to mind are yachts, working boats -- and in this class, I'd say mostly fishing boats would be what I would call working boats -- transportation vessels, and military vessels. I am sure there are a lot more

types that could be added, and this isn't meant to be sort of, "Well, if a boat doesn't fit into one of these types, then obviously there's something wrong." But the type of vessel that it was built to be is going to play a major, major role in any maintenance program.

Right now, that is probably talking about appearance, primarily. Vessels that are built to be yachts should be finished off as yachts. Vessels that are built like fishing boats shouldn't be finished off as yachts, and it would probably be a losing proposition to finish many fishing boats to look like a yacht. You can waste an awful lot of time on labor on work boats that never would have been intended to have been done. It just wouldn't be appropriate. I think that a fishing boat that is all painted up with high gloss paint and just looking all real spiffy, I don't think that is the way they should look. But they shouldn't look neglected, either, so there is a fine line in between there.

I think this is where you could get into another problem with standards, though. I have just said that fishing boats should be finished one way and yachts should be finished another way. If we had written standards that said yachts should have high gloss topsides, varnished masts, or however you were

going to do it -- some standards can get very, very specific -- there could be very well-meaning people that could take, on the face of it, "Well, appearance is more important perhaps than keeping the deck tight." I mean, it says right here in the standards that we have got to have a real high gloss on the topsides, and the deck could be leaking. In that case, people would be far better off tending to the deck and perhaps giving the topsides a real quick coat of flat paint. That is kind of a compromise that has to be made, and people just have to realize that those things have to be decided on the local level.

Military and transportation vessels are probably somewhat of an easier problem. Generally, they're newer, and I think in a lot of cases there are a lot more people who remember, for instance, a ferryboat or military vessels. I believe, in the case of the military vessels, there are a lot more manuals written on how they should look and what color they should be and when they should be painted. I think it is just easier to determine. If you get into a case like the Charles Morgan, some books talk about -- Richard Henry Dana talks about whalers that you could smell before you could see them, and they were just dirty, greasy, filthy boats. We can't do that. So, in

a lot of cases, you can't be really clear how the boat should be kept. But there is a lot that can be done to make sure that it is kept pretty well.

Another big variable that has to be decided is the present use of the vessel. We have already discussed that it's not sufficient to say that it's a museum vessel, so it should be kept a certain way, because practically every vessel that the seaport owns is kept to a little bit different standard. We have some boats that are really in terrible shape and are just waiting until we have the time to restore them. We've got some boats that have been restored and we are treating one way. The Brilliant is a 63-foot schooner that was built in the Thirties, and she is maintained to very high yacht standards, and, in a lot of cases, very modern materials are used in her upkeep. The Sabino is used to carry passengers, and she is kept a little bit more traditionally. We have her engine in her, her original steam engine, and that is what is used to power her. Some of the paints we use are fairly modern, some of them aren't.

The Morgan is maintained almost exclusively with traditional materials. I am not sure they're 1840 traditional materials. So I think there are a lot of definitions that need to be worked out, that still need

to be worked out.

The thing to remember is that we are considering what the boat is going to be doing, tempered by what has been done in the past. And the farther we go down this thought process, the less options we have.

After the present use is considered, the maintenance program can be designed to accomodate specific needs. Machinery can be laid up, if that is going to be applicable. The machinery can be removed, if that is the thing to do. I am trying to stay just talking about maintenance, but it all applies. It is the same for restoration. It's the same for so many different aspects of things.

Museum ships that are laid up in port will require different maintenance programs, even if the same materials are used as on a ship that is going to be sailed either for sail training or for goodwill tours or whatever, because the conditions that the vessel is being kept under are different.

Another problem that has to be looked into is the standards of past work that was done on the vessel. There are probably three or four categories that past work could fall into. We don't end up with just a newly restored boat very often. One would be what's

proper for what the vessel is meant to portray and, in general, good work. The second one, and this is a little bit of a touchy one, could be improper for what the vessel was going to portray but it's good work nonetheless. And then the easy one would be poor quality work, and that is just probably something that is going to be done over time.

I think an example of good work that may want to be undone at some point would be if a museum was given a yacht that had been updated over time or had been given a fishing boat that was updated over time -- the boat may not be in need of restoration, so you decide, "Well, we're going to have a maintenance program and we're going to just go along with it."

Well, that may not fit the style that the boat is. If you are going to portray it as a 1940 boat or a 1890 boat, there is going to be a lot of things on it that might be good that you are just going to want to take off. That can all be done as part of the maintenance program. It doesn't have to be restoration work, as long as you've got a plan and you're not just going in and tearing stuff out before you know what it is.

I am sure the effective budget is all too clear on all of us. Sometimes it's just a minor

aggravation that causes a project to slow down or proceed at an erratic pace. The more serious ramifications of a budget problem, though, is that it forces us to make compromises and all too often to do things that are just plain wrong. This can be worked around, I think, a fair amount, if the plan is in place before you get started. Then, chances are, you are going to have a rough idea of how much it's going to cost to maintain the ship. And then if you are hit with unrealistic budget restraints -- unrealistic in terms of what needs to be done, but they may be realistic in terms of somebody else saying, "Well, that is all the money there is," you have to go back and reassess things. Because the worst thing that could happen would be to get going on something and just have to stop. Then you haven't finished the projects you've started. And there are a lot of ships that have been partially worked on, they have to stop. They have started too ambitiously. It's much better to start small and finish the jobs as they go along, get the ship stabilized, and then just go along.

Now, I wasn't intending to get into specific practices. I didn't think that this needed to be a session on how to paint or how to do any of the specific things that are involved with ships. But I

think there are some things that are so universal that if you could ever say are standards, there are a few things that ought to be standards on ships.

The first one would be ventilation. I think whether it's steel or wood, it's an absolute requirement to the longevity of the hull.

Cleanliness. Again, there is no reason for a boat in any state to look dirty. I mean, they should be clean. Cleanliness. You get a little dirt in the corner and it gets wet and it stays wet and starts things to rot.

One that we don't think about too often when we are talking about maintenance is the security of the vessel. I think that all too often it's just ignored. I think it covers a lot of things, from burglar alarms and fire alarms -- this depends on how secure the vessel is where it is, if it's inside a fenced-in area or not. Sprinklers. We have just put a sprinkler system on one of our ships, and we at some point in the future will probably be doing one or two more of them.

Moorings. We have an elaborate hurricane procedure at the seaport because we have so many vessels to take care of, and there is always a chance that we might get a hurricane. I think it's one of the first things, that you have to get the vessel in a

secure spot. If that is not going to be good enough for a hurricane or for whatever the local weather condition may be, then provisions should be made so that you can put your hurricane procedures into effect quickly.

Another major, important thing is the watertight integrity of the deck and the topsides. It almost goes without saying, although it doesn't get done frequently enough.

The last would be that there should be a real routine, ongoing maintenance program. There should be people that all their job is is to keep it clean, keep it washed, keep it painted. That is a major expenditure right there. And then, beyond that, all the other more or less routine maintenance work that needs to be done quite often will be either seen by those people or there is somebody there all the time keeping an eye on things.

That is about all I had to say. Does anyone have any questions.

MR. TOM McGRATH: My first question is on sprinkler systems. Are you up-front about them or are you trying to hide them?

MR. DANA HEWSON: Fortunately, I don't have to answer that. No.

[Laughter]

MR. DANA HEWSON: On the Conrad, which is the ship that we put it in, which we put a new deck on last year, outwardly the vessel is treated one way. The 'tween decks area is used for housing kids in the mariner training program, and we were very up-front about it. We didn't try to hide it. The boat doesn't have a ceiling, so we couldn't very well hide it.

We tried not to interfere any more than we had to. We came up the side of the ship, and, wherever possible, put side mount sprinkler heads on.

From what I have been told, they can do the whole compartment -- it's an open compartment. Side mount heads can do the whole thing.

I think you have to be up-front about it. I don't think -- well, my own personal view is that things like that can't be hidden enough so that they won't show, so you should do it as nicely as you can do it. That is where they are. People make concessions to having lights that are visible. It's obvious that a boat has been artificially illuminated. And smoke detectors. You can't very well hide them from all angles.

MR. TOM McGRATH: Second question. Emergency plan. Who's in charge? I mean, does Revell come down

and direct it? Do you?

MR. DANA HEWSON: You mean the hurricane procedure?

MR. TOM McGRATH: Do you have a printed plan on board ship? Do you have a printed procedure and plan?

MR. DANA HEWSON: Yes. It's not maybe posted as well as it should be, but the hurricane plan for the whole museum is basically that every department has a section, and they write their own hurricane plan for the department, and that is updated every year. Then every spring, that is printed back out again, and every department gets a copy of the whole museum's plan. Within that is the plan for the department.

So, when the museum decides that, "Well, we are going to go into the hurricane procedures," then I would be in charge of the whole shipyard's end of the plan, yes.

MR. TOM McGRATH: One more question. Are there any recommendations -- you have seen this museum. We have a superintendent, we have a unit manager. If we had a fire, we'd have the city Fire Department coming down.

Should we have a designated plan about who is in charge and who is going to make those dockside

decisions?

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: You got to.

MR. DANA HEWSON: I think so. The way it's handled at the seaport, and I can't say for other institutions what is right, but the seaport has a Fire Marshal, who is one of the employees who is in the local Fire Department, volunteer Fire Department.

The way it's set up is that if there is a fire, until the Fire Department can get there, he is in charge of the fire. And there are certain plans in place, that when the fire alarm goes off or it's determined there is a fire, the people that work there are supposed to get the visitors off first. That is the first and foremost consideration. Then we do have fire extinguishers around. If we can get artifacts out of a section of the building that isn't perhaps in immediate danger, fine. But those types of decisions would probably be made by the department head and the Fire Marshal. By then, the Fire Department would be there, and the town is responsible or they're in charge of the fire.

What we did on the Conrad when we put in the sprinkler system, though, was, we made a separate switch. If there is a fire, the normal procedure is automatically to turn off the electrical system. So,

now we've got a fire on board, the electrical system shut off, the pumps aren't working. The Fire Department is putting water in, the sprinklers are putting water in -- you fill the ship up. So, her bilge pumps are on a separate switch also, which is also off the switch, but there is the main panel and then there is another panel, and the bilge pumping capacity is more than capable of pumping out everything that the sprinkler system can put in. So, hopefully, we wouldn't sink her.

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: A comment on that. The Constitution is sprinklered. The pipes are obvious. But it's a dry system, so that you don't have fresh water in the sprinkler pipes, which may leak. The system is held by compressed air. And you have an air compressor on board. So if the system bleeds down for whatever reason without the head going off due to a fire, it just pumps up the air on board again.

We have the same thing. As soon as you have a fire, the sprinkler system goes off, the electricity goes. But we have an inductor system, not electric pumps. So we don't need electricity to pump out the ship.

And the attitude about the Constitution was, it's our ship. The Fire Department is there to assist

us. And the fire fighting is done by the people who know the ship best, know where, how to get in and around and down and to and through the ship. The Fire Department never gets on board. They will come up and stand on the pier and just fill her up with water if you allow them to.

MR. TOM McGRATH: The reason I asked these questions. I don't know if anybody knows the history of the Sprague, but there was a lot of legend whether the fire on board the Sprague could have been put out or not put out. There was a dockside debate, evidently, while the Sprague burned. The Sprague has since been lost as a ship. It was the largest paddlewheel steamer ever built. Kind of nobody knows about it. That was my presentation, a little-known story.

But I would ask you, Dana -- I'd sure like to see your plans, if we could get copies. I know it would help this organization.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Because I think that this goes along a little bit with it. It is a little bit off the subject of maintenance. But we have a wood stove, a wood-burning stove on the Dunton that is in use sometimes in the winter, and we have a wood-burning stove on the Morgan which is not in use. That is a

little bit of an inconsistency in our thinking, I think.

I think in all of these things, when it comes to alarms and fires and sprinkler systems and all of that, at given point it's a very low risk, but the consequences are just unthinkable. A vessel like the Constitution or any big -- the Morgan, the Dunton -- would probably be going so fast, by the time the Fire Department got there, there might not be much that they could do.

MR. TOM McGRATH: Or the Eureka.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Yes. I think that if you think in terms of keeping these vessels indefinitely, sometime, in 200 years, if that is how long we are going to have them, somebody is going to have a really serious fire on board. We came close on the Dunton one time. It was one of those things that all the things that could possibly go wrong went wrong. The assumption was that the alarm system was working. There was a cup over it so they use the stove. Nobody called the security department because they assumed the alarm was going to go in. It got put out with a fire extinguisher. But it did blacken the whole inside of the fo'c'sle on the Dunton.

I think that any of those things -- a

hurricane, sure, chances are that we are not going to get a hurricane, but sooner or later there is going to be. And 12-foot tides are going to raise havoc. So I think all those things have to be planned for, because otherwise you are not going to have anything. You'll end up with a ship up on top of the dock, just totally destroyed.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: There was a conference in Victoria last year on disaster preparedness, giving an ideal list, chain of command list, who is in charge of what, who's the person to go to -- not only before the event, but afterwards, when you have got to start cleaning up and get artifacts out of there and get them to a place where you can conserve them right away, or stabilize them, at least.

It did give ideal situations for how that should be done.

MR. TOM McGRATH: Guidelines?

[Laughter]

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: I wasn't going to say that.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Were they published? Is it available?

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: I haven't seen anything published yet. The people from Halifax were there, too.

FROM THE FLOOR: I haven't seen anything published.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: They said they would. Anybody who wants the stuff real bad, I can get their address and Xerox the stuff that I've got and send it off.

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: One of the things I find disturbing and found disturbing, if you have people who have ships who are not used to ships, they look at them as an artifact, as a museum, which you go in in the morning, you turn on the heating and walk away, and at 5:00 o'clock, you go home. A ship is in an environment that is not the type of thing you can turn off at 5:00 o'clock at night and turn back on again at 9:00 o'clock in the morning. It has to be maintained, looked after twenty-four hours a day. Mooring lines need to be checked, depending on tides and wind currents, and have to be adjusted. You have to have at least somebody on board awake who knows what's going on, can sense that there is something wrong with the ship, especially a valuable one. You can't walk into it and treat it like an office.

MR. JOHN MOAUNIS: Dana, I'd like to know a little bit more about what your maintenance plans are. How much detail do you go into in the plan itself?

MR. DANA HEWSON: Perhaps not as much as we should. I think all of this can either be relatively simple or -- I mean, there are certain parts of it that are hard, certain parts that are easy.

We have a book. We just call it the paint manual. Basically it just describes very briefly the fact that, well, say, the Emma C. Berry is a fishing vessel, that she never would have been sandpapered when they were fishing with her, so we don't sandpaper. We use this color paint, we use this type of paint, we use this in the seams, and that is it. And then we keep a record, a daily log, of what is done to the boat on a maintenance level. That is about it.

We should have, I think, more written statements of purpose than we do. This is going to sound a little bit defensive, and maybe it is, but I think that we are in a position at the seaport that we have been there for a long time, and we have been doing the same thing, and we'd like to think we are doing them better now than we used to do them. But there is a lot of continuity within any one department. I think that that can go a long way towards the planning. But I think there should be more written down than we have.

MR. KARL KORTUM: I have a question of Tom McGrath. I want to know when you started your talk on

deterioration, whether you put that poster up behind you on purpose.

[Laughter]

MR. KARL KORTUM: Actually, I have a serious question. When I was last on the Morgan, you had this fan system for ventilating a ship. It would be interesting to hear you comment on that, and also Commander Sudsholtzer's comment, the same thing on the Constitution.

MR. DANA HEWSON: We have, since we finished -- well, we didn't finish. We finished one phase of the restoration on the Morgan. We have had fans down below, one in the bow -- this is in the hold -- one in the bow and one in the stern. The theory was that it would draw air down and work to the center of the ship where it would go up through the main hatch and go out.

We also have wind socks or wind vents that go from the rigging down into the main, into the 'tween decks area. I think that it's absolutely important to do that. You can really see, on a nice day, you can really see a difference in the humidity. But down in the hold, the humidity averages about 80 percent or higher on a year-round basis. It is almost a constant line. The only time that really varies is, in New

England, we get a lot of real hot, muggy weather, where that 80 percent might be the outide humidity for long periods of time. In the spring and fall, when you go from humid days to just beautiful, cool, crisp days, we can get a big reduction in the humidity. You can see the graph, and it will just go right down for a few hours and then the weather changes and it goes back up again.

But I guess what you're trying to do is to evaporate moisture or get rid of moisture, and either reduce, lower the level of moisture in the wood or, if you're getting water down, evaporate the water. But I guess in the hold area, I don't think we can ever get it as dry as we might like to.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: There are two types of forced ventilation on the Constitution. One of them takes ambient outside air and basically, for winter purposes only, to put heated air, use steam, and blow heated air into the ship. We are so far north, the temperature variations are atrocious. So we try and keep the inside air at about 60 degrees in the wintertime, 60, 65 degrees. It's not that simple a system. But it runs through aluminum ducting, industrial pipe ducting through the ship, and use hatches to get the air below decks, take it all the way

down below. It comes back out on its own, up through the main hatch and a number of companionways. But below the orlot deck, she is constructed such that you have voids along either side of the keel, et cetera, which are barely crawl spaces.

What we have done is put a blower in the forward part of the ship where we can blow air in. And since it doesn't open up midships like Morgan does, but goes all the way aft, back aft, we put a sucking-type blower. It draws the air that's going out the aft, being blown up forward. And that after blower then just vents to the vicinity of the main hold, and the air rises from there.

But you get a nice constant air flow through there. You would have trouble lighting a match or something -- not that you'd want to -- but it would blow out because of the amount of air volume you have flowing through there.

The ship is dry. She just never, ever is damp or sweats or anything. The inside of the vessel is dry. The only place we have any moisture at all is where we have our little electric bilge pump near the main mast step.

MR. DAVID WALKER: What is the humidity level?

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: We just use ambient

ventilators, so they get that nice chimney effect -- assuming that they have access down in the bilge for air, although that is sort of working in reverse. I mean, you ought to be forcing the dry air down. But the natural chimney effect is to just come up through, and that is going to have some air circulation, assuming there is a way to do it.

But other than that, I don't think there is any way you could do it on a big vessel and be sure you were doing it unless you had a manifold and fans. I don't think you could do it.

MR. KARL KORTUM: How many ventilators are there.

MR. DANA HEWSON: On the Cornet, I don't know. There is one between every frame.

MR. KARL KORTUM: Are there 50 inside or something like that?

MR. DANA HEWSON: Probably more than that. She is a big boat. I think, from what I have been told, they have been in there for a long, long time. I don't know that they're original, but they are certainly very old.

MR. DAVID WALKER: When all else fails and you decide, as you did with the Australia, that the ship is too far gone to bring back, how do you make the

decision? Say a few words about deaccession.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Well, she hasn't been.

MR. DAVID WALKER: Sorry.

MR. DANA HEWSON: But the decision was made that she just couldn't be rebuilt. I assume that was based on budget, the condition of the boat, all the things that we talked about a little earlier.

I don't know what the procedure would be. That would a real painful procedure to have to follow, and Seaport has done it a couple of times. But I haven't been involved with it, so I really don't know what the procedures would be.

MR. JOHN CONWAY: Do you use salt --

MR. DANA HEWSON: Yes.

MR. JOHN CONWAY: -- for preservation of wood?

MR. DANA HEWSON: Yes. Every day -- well, the Conrad has an iron hull. She is washed down with fresh water. The Morgan and the Dunton are washed down with river water, about 75 percent of which is as saline as normal ocean water, and the other boats, we use a brine barrel in a small work boat, and we go from boat to boat and wash them down with the brine solution.

The theory behind that is that salt is somewhat or very hydroscopic, so it will hold moisture in the wood, so, theoretically, the deck planks would

stay tighter so that you won't have deck leaks or you won't be as a prone to deck leaks.

The other side of that, I suppose, is that, assuming you are going to have deck leaks, then you are getting salt into them so that when you do get a rainstorm with fresh water, what you'll end up with is fresh water mixing with the salt. So you still have salt, and that is slightly fungicidal.

The problem is, is raises cane with the fastenings. I think what you're doing is making a decision that -- you know, a lot of boats when they get to the point where they're rotten, they are still held together very well by the fastenings. If you can extend the life of the wood by some number of years, then maybe the fastenings and the wood will go at about the same time. So, I think you can extend the life of the boat a little bit.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: I have a digression about sprinkler systems. I worked on Nonsuch, a 50-foot replica ketch, wood, built by the Hudson Bay Company. She's in Winnipeg, Manitoba right now. They're building a museum. They have a sprinkler system in there. They chose to disguise the sprinkler system by putting it into shadows, which they created with the lighting situation inside.

We found that there was a leaking sprinkler head. It leaked for two years. We didn't find out about it until somebody noticed a hole in the deck, which the water had rotted, started in there.

So that is something to be very careful about, with sprinkler systems. It's probably better --

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: It wouldn't have happened if you had a dry system.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: -- to have the proper system or have them right up-front. Don't try to hide them. It's something that has to be there, and that is that.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Ours is also a dry system on the Conrad.

MR. TOM McGRATH: Would you ventilate Wapama? That is that boat -- you have both been there.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Yes. Although I must say, if this is routine weather for around here, you know, things seem to ventilate themselves quite well.

[Laughter]

I was surprised, when we went below on a couple of the boats, that they were as dry as they were. Our boats, we get week after week in the summer of very high humidity and very high temperatures. It will be 80 degrees.

MR. TOM McGRATH: How about Eureka. How do

you feel about that?

MR. DANA HEWSON: I don't know whether her hold or below the main deck was ventilated, but if it's not, I would think it should be. But without seeing it, I can't really say that.

MR. TOM McGRATH: It is.

MR. STRAFFORD MORSS: Have you ever used dessicant cannisters or mechanical dehumidification?

MR. DANA HEWSON: No, we haven't. It's something that I have thought about a little bit. But with the hold open, for instance, on the Morgan, I think it might be a losing process.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: I would think about it seriously on a ship like the Massachusetts, where you have closed compartments that remain closed, in order to create a permanent dry -- much like they were when they were mothballed. I would think about it seriously in that situation.

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Two things. One, there is a graduate student from museum study at GW University who is writing his master's paper on security for ships. I think that is going to be finished within the next year, certainly, and I'm hoping to stay on top of it.

And the second thing. Do you have a drill for

emergency procedures?

MR. DANA HEWSON: Not fire drills. And there is --

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Hurricane.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Hurricane, yes. We seem to change the location -- well, it's not a drill that we all go and go ahead and do it, but we spend a fair amount of time every spring determining where the boats are going to be. We have a complete set of extra dock lines for almost all of the boats that are either on the boat or in a nice safe storage area. And when the decision is made that the museum is going to batten down for a hurricane, the crews are somewhat lined up. There are certain people that have certain responsibilities. And just whoever is there, that is who ends up going with them.

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: You review that setup every year?

MR. DANA HEWSON: Yes. We spent a fair amount of time on it this summer, because there were some big changes that occurred in vessel locations in the past couple of years. But it is rewritten every year. Again, it seems to be getting better every year.

MR. KARL KORTUM: In view of your statement that salt water is better for decks, hydroscopically,

what would you think, using your example of the iron ship, of using the process of salt water, a brine washdown, and then a light sprinkling of fresh water afterwards to clear away enough brine so you don't have extensive corrosion behind.

MR. DANA HEWSON: I don't know. I think it would have to be something that -- you could probably see whether you were having a problem fairly soon. I think you would have rust streaks before you'd have any major problems.

Our feeling with the Conrad is -- she has a teak deck. We know it has a teak deck, a brand new teak deck. So it should last a long time without the salt. The others, I would think you would want to try and see. I know they stopped salt water washdowns on the Elissa because of corrosion problems.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: We tried that system of using the fire mains on the deck. We were pumping salt water. That also let us make sure the fire pumps worked every day. And then go around with a little garden hose with fresh water and wash off the hatch coamings and the bulwarks. We found that by the time

what would you think, using your example of the iron ship, of using the process of salt water, a brine washdown, and then a light sprinkling of fresh water afterwards to clear away enough brine so you don't have extensive corrosion behind.

MR. DANA HEWSON: I don't know. I think it would have to be something that -- you could probably see whether you were having a problem fairly soon. I think you would have rust streaks before you'd have any major problems.

Our feeling with the Conrad is -- she has a teak deck. We know it has a teak deck, a brand new teak deck. So it should last a long time without the salt. The others, I would think you would want to try and see. I know they stopped salt water washdowns on the Elissa because of corrosion problems.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: We tried that system of using the fire mains on the deck. We were pumping salt water. That also let us make sure the fire pumps worked every day. And then go around with a little garden hose with fresh water and wash off the hatch coamings and the bulwarks. We found that by the time you'd -- you know, it's back and forth between the hatch coamings and waterways and gutters and bulwarks on different deck levels. By the time you'd do a

pretty good job of washing off the steel, we felt we'd probably saturated the deck with fresh water again.

It also just took a lot longer. So we found we didn't do it as often. We kept the deck oiled and just kept water on it to keep it tight so we didn't have any gaping seams or didn't have penetration far into it, that probably it would still last for a long time. But the effects of the salt were immediately visible on steel, and we were fighting a losing battle.

MR. KARL KORTUM: Right. But it's awfully good in other respects, that it keeps the wood wet.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: It's a matter of wetting the wood often, keeping it tight, and also maybe oiled, have an oiled coating on the deck that can be renewed every few months.

MR. KARL KORTUM: Do you renew the decks, oil the decks every few months?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Yes, we try to get to it at least three times a year.

MR. KARL KORTUM: Okay.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Tom has just given me the sign that that is it.

[Applause]

MODERATOR McGRATH: We are running about 45 minutes late. I know we all want to hear what Bob Darr

has to say. But I hear that the cheese cake is melting. Let's take a 15-minute break, and then we will listen to what Bob Darr has to say.

[Short recess]

MODERATOR McGRATH: If I can have your attention. One more time, I urge you to take handouts. Take more handouts and give them to your colleagues. I'd like to ask everybody to take their seat for our next presentation.

Certainly this is an element, and you've heard many speakers discuss this in the past two days, an element of preservation, restoration, maintenance of large museum ships is the skills. We are fortunate to have one of our preeminent wooden ship builders who has a very unusual background and history in terms of his upbringing and his current vocation with us. I sat spellbound several months ago and listened to Bob. We are fortunate that we have been able to have him here. One of the things that happens with these guys who are in skills training is they somehow become gurus, and it's hard to lead the operation with the discipline of the disciples. But Bob was able to come over to be with us and talk with us.

So, I'd like introduce Bob Darr, the Director of the Center for Wood Arts, a nonprofit school for

traditional boat-building here in the Bay Area.

[Applause].

MR. BOB DARR: I am going to start by just giving you a little bit of background, not much, but about myself just so you know which faucet your water is coming from.

I was raised on some of the large schooner yachts that were on the West Coast here in the 1950's and Sixties. My father is Captain Omar Darr, and I was raised as a sailor. But as a teenager, people started to notice that I was more interested in the construction end. And so my father said, "Would you like to go into boat building?" I said, "Yes, I would." So he arranged for various training with different craftsmen who are boat builders and also people more competent at restoration and rigging.

So, since that time, I have done my training. I started teaching about eight years ago. Since about eight years ago, I have set up several programs that deal with teaching traditional boat building and also what we call here preservation.

Now, I don't know if anybody read my abstract, but the claim in the abstract is basically that it's not easy. Just like what you're doing isn't easy. What we are trying to do, all of us, seems to be going

against the mainstream of western culture in some ways -- meaning there is an interest in historical monuments, but even that interest is not always precisely helpful to what we are trying do.

There was a point brought up by one of the gentlemen here that vessels should not be treated as offices. Well, you see, people do in fact do that. You see, they look at the superficial side of any of our vessels, some of these people, and they don't realize that it takes a great deal of money, and they may not be able to even believe or credit how much money and effort it would take to restore some of the vessels that we need to restore.

I haven't been here the last few days, but I can only imagine that there has been a great deal of useful information about how to plan for budgets and how to plan for restoration and so forth. But my department, as it were, is how to train the people to be able to do this kind of work.

It is important, I think, that we look at what size of a fleet we have, as it were, of vessels that need to be restored and preserved, and then we look at, for the future, how many people will it take to do those jobs and how are they, after all, going to get their training? There are a lot of people who are

doing restoration work and preservation work who are very qualified, and many of them did not go through any traditional apprenticeship training. Some did, however, and some have not. But many others are only really partly qualified.

If you think of the museums that you have been to -- I don't know how many of you know the details going on behind the scenes, but you will run into people who are not adequately trained, and there really is, unfortunately, no adequate program to train these people, in many cases. Now, there are very, very great exceptions to this, and I would like to say that I think, for example -- I have not been all over the East Coast, but I think what's going at Mystic Seaport is a very fine example of a place where there is a combination of training skills with preservation work with some new boat building. I think they have one of the finest programs in the country.

So we need first to identify our goals. In terms of teaching people, we have to decide what is it that we need the most. In each case, you are going to come up with a different answer, I am sure. For your museum, you are going to come up with different kinds of training that you need. In some cases, you may need somebody who is only a painter, but a really good

painter. And in other cases, you may not have the budget for only having somebody partially skilled that way, so you may have to invest money, museums may have to invest money in training programs.

The school that I am directing currently is called the Center for Wood Arts. I have sort of roughly broken down how I see our time being spent. Let me also point out that we are not doing a lot of restoration work ourselves. We mainly take students in and teach them the basics of handtool use. We do focus on traditional boat building. We've actually got a market in traditional boat building. You see, there are enough people building fiberglass boats and even called molded boats, which I have nothing against, by the way, but there are so many of these people doing those things, there is still a small percentage of the market left over for people who want traditional boats. And so we focus on that market, and we use that as a basis to run our skills training program. Because traditional boat building, more than the other kinds of boat building, really demands a high degree of skill. There are many jobs that simply cannot be done with power tools. So we actually have set this up, this format up where we need to get in jobs involving traditional boat building so that we can in fact train

people to use the tools and learn the methods to do this.

I can think of other ways of doing this. For example, perhaps one of the museums gets funded to do a very large restoration job, and they use that as a context to teach people as well as doing their job. So perhaps they bring in people on an apprenticeship level with some of the craftsmen who are there, and those people in turn benefit. And then we have some way of assessing what they have gained from it. There has to be some feedback.

So, there are many ways that one could set up various programs. At this time, there are in fact at least a couple of dozen programs around the United States that are offering skills training. We spend about 25 percent of our time in theoretical stuff. So, in other words, a bit of our time is spent in lecturing and also giving students homework to do. So, what they have to do is, one day out of the week, usually, there is a long lecture, a series of lectures, and those lectures are based on techniques and theories of design construction, joinery, lofting, et cetera, which they can find information about in various books, some of which I am sure you've read.

The thing that you'll notice, if you read

these books, of course, is that very often they're saying different things. And that is a characteristic of our profession, is that it is difficult to establish which is the right method, and which is not the right method. My feeling on this is that if it's seaworthy, it's the right method. There is a lot of variation that can go on in that area.

But what's interesting is that if you take a large number of theories and ideas and you present them to students, then they learn these and it becomes a context for them to then be able to do the major part of their training, which is skill. It involves more than skill. It involves an attitude adjustment and the use of their hands.

So, one of the things that we have tried to emphasize, and I could recommend it to you, is that the teacher is grounded in more than his own method, perhaps. Or you have more than one teacher; that's another possibility. The advantage of this is that students can see various ways of doing thing, and they can choose what seem to be the best ways. There was some talk by the speaker before me about maintaining a fishing boat with a fishing boat finish. The same thing is true with construction details. A fishing boat is a different kind of boat. And it is good for

people to learn all of this as background.

I remember when I was a kid, my father was teaching me to sail. A lot of people were saying, "Oh, don't read the sailing books, because sailing isn't in books." My father would say, "Read the sailing books." And what would happen, you see, is you would get a blueprint. You may not even remember it, but it will come to you at the right time. So it's important that they have this theoretical blueprint about whatever it is that we are teaching them.

So, some time has to be spent in establishing a program to ensure that the material is competent and qualified for whatever the program is that you are interested in. And again, I realize that may be very different in different cases.

That was 25 percent of the time, you see. So, of the remaining time, most of it, probably 60 percent of it, is spent working alongside of people and then giving them a chance to work with craftsmen who are already experienced. At our school, we have a combination of guys my age, and then we bring in some older craftsmen from time to time who are either teachers of mine or others to show another method.

The idea here is that you do need, most of the time -- this is not an academic thing. Part of it is,

as mentioned. But it depends upon so many things which are not academic. It's like trying to train somebody to be a good horseman. You have to have the right setup. You have to have a competent instructor. And you have to have somebody who has some natural talent. This is true in our field. There are people who have all of the desire in the world to do this, but they don't have the ability that it takes, which is unfortunate.

There is an old saying in our trade, "competence, not desire." I think that it holds true at every level. When I am counseling people who will come to me who wish to be students, what I have to do is interview them several times and make sure that they really do fit into such a program. So, the hands-on thing, even though we can't really talk about that a lot because we are saying it isn't a theoretical side -- it is the most important part of what we are doing.

Here is the serious problem, that this is not like a lot of our things here in California, you know, like, "Oh, well, I'll learn it in a weekend."

[Laughter]

MR. BOB DARR: You know, "I'll become happy and content, and what have you, in a weekend" kind of a

thing. There are boat-building programs based on this concept, and I find them somewhat absurd, frankly. Because if you're in this thing -- I have had conversations with these people, and they think I'm looney, because I say, "Oh, let's go to the moon and get some cheese." Because it's the same thing. It's the same kind of thing. If you want to talk that way, fine. But then let's agree that we are going to speak that way.

But, in fact, our whole field involves a tremendous investment of energy. You have to train someone for five years before you can really let them loose in a sort of final sense. Our program is only a one-year program, but we have an ongoing training system whereby they make money after they have graduated or they're placed somewhere, and then they can still come to us and get what guidance they need.

But the point is, it is a very long-term investment. What's dangerous about this is that we don't live in a culture that is very interested in this sort of thing. One can't really blame the culture. The culture is going in another direction, so it's difficult to say to somebody, "Do you realize that you are going to need to really put in some time for five years minimum before you really start to know anything

about this?" And people say, "But your brochure says that you have a one-year program."

At that point, we talk some more and try to work it out. But you try to get the idea across to them that this is important.

Now, the last part of our time, some amount of time we allot for career and attitude counseling, we like to call it, in a friendly way. The important thing here is that, you see, again we come back to this thing where our real problem -- once we have established the facility, that is a very, very big step. The facility is well equipped, is funded.

Foremost in this thing is that you have instructors who are qualified. This means that these people aren't just craftsmen. These people are teachers. You see, I know some very, very fine old craftsmen. Some of these people were my teachers. Without exaggerating, there would be times when maybe this person was having a bad day or something, and they would literally sort of throw things at you or sort of slap you on the shoulder, if not worse. You cannot do this now. It's not possible. We have never tried it, actually --

[Laughter]

MR. BOB DARR: But we know from talking to

people -- we are certified by the State of California, and we are not allowed to hit people. But actually, the advantage of the old apprenticeship training system was that you had to be a pretty tough guy -- or these days, gal, too -- to make it through such a training system. The system weeded out the unfortunates who weren't really qualified to be there.

Now, it also happened to weed out a lot of other nice people, some of whom may have been brilliant as craftsmen. But the system needed people who could, on a daily basis and for years on end, do this kind of work almost as production work. If you want to think of our industry as it really was, think of the auto industry today, for example. Now, I realize the auto industry, you know, "How grotesque. How can you compare it to the boat industry?" But it really was. There were caulkers and there were joiners and there were plankers and there were people who only hung planks. So things were on a mass production scale. It wasn't the sort of the more wonderful thing that we have turned it into.

In those days, the apprenticeship system weeded out the people who could not make it. We cannot do this, you see, for a lot of reasons. We are not running a mass production system. We are not producing

yachts or work boats in any way near that kind of system.

The other thing is that we are going about it in a different way. In my training, as like everyone, I spent a lot of time picking up after the boat builder, going for this and going for that and so forth. But what we do instead is, we say, "Look, we know what we are doing. You pay us and we won't treat you like a moron. We wouldn't have you sweep the shop for two years or any that stuff. We will hire people to do that." This is the sort of program I want to recommend to you. What I am saying is that we have a time problem. We have to condense the training time somewhat, and we have to also identify who is really going to be able to stay in it.

If in your industry, in our industry, we are interested in long-term professionals to restore vessels, to maintain vessels, and so forth, we are not interested in the people who want to have sort of a fling with this thing, like, "Oh, yes. Last year it was this and this year it's boat building." There are a lot of these people. We want people -- as an investment, I am talking about. Forget the humanitarian side, which is that these people need to be occupied, or whatever it is.

[Laughter]

MR. BOB DARR: Or these people think it's wonderful, and all the awful things that develop from that, including the guruism that Tom was bringing up. We may have to carry on a bit of that charade. We might have to because of needing money, for example. But, on the other hand, we are trying -- our intent, our goal is to produce people who can stay in the field for a long period of time and who can do this work.

So we have to set up a program that really is qualified to assess these things. That means that it starts with the administration of the program, which I have a little bit to do with, but I have to say, you need somebody who is more qualified in a sense of somebody who is already administrating a larger program, who has the vision to pick somebody who really is capable of organizing such a program.

Now, in my opinion, I have met people like Lance Lee, for example, and I think Lance Lee is the sort of guy who really can organize a program, because he knows how to get money, he knows how to talk to people, he knows how to change people's minds. You need somebody who has this kind of vision. And maybe their vision is different than yours or mine, but the point is, they have the guts to go ahead with it and to

set it up. Whatever you do, don't get an amateur to set up a program. It will not work. It's that simple. It cannot work. Because there are too many things that can go wrong.

So, the important thing first, then, is that we get somebody who can administrate such a program, and then they, in turn, are capable of choosing these odd people that I am talking about who are craftsmen and teachers. They have a natural inclination to want to pass on what they know. When you see them, you know who they are, if you're in my field, anyway. You know. If you work with them, you know who they are within a day or two. They're the guys who are not getting pissed off every five minutes because it is not going their way. They're the ones who also have a vested interest in teaching. They feel on some essential level that this is simply what you do. This is important. You pass this on because it should be endemic, it should be part of the community. They just have this feeling. There aren't a lot of these people.

When you go to produce craftsmen in the sense of having a training system, 20 percent of the craftsmen that come out are going to be in some way gifted as teachers as well. That is just to give you a rough figure here. That is our experience. So, about

in it to make money, you can be sure about that. So we have to try to find a way of employing them and making sure that they feel like there is some kind of a future out there for them -- without being deceptive. When I talk to students, I say, "Look, when you first get out, buy a van or live in a garage. You are probably going to make, if you're doing a bid job, you might make ten bucks an hour, if you're lucky. Maybe you'll get a position somewhere that will pay you a salary, but even this, you cannot count on." But I am realistic with them. It's important to have some kind of career counseling aspect to what you're doing.

Now, the second point -- I don't know who received my outline and who did not, but the second point, the difficulties. Coming back to these difficulties, the main one that I have identified for myself is the cultural problems just dealing with this in 20th century society in the United States.

The first thing I'd like to point out is that about ten years ago, there was very little talk about wooden boat building. Those of you who were around in the museum stuff then know that this is true. There was suddenly a big interest in various crafts, and wooden boat building is one of them. The journal Wooden Boat now has, I think, a subscription of 180,000

in it to make money, you can be sure about that. So we have to try to find a way of employing them and making sure that they feel like there is some kind of a future out there for them -- without being deceptive. When I talk to students, I say, "Look, when you first get out, buy a van or live in a garage. You are probably going to make, if you're doing a bid job, you might make ten bucks an hour, if you're lucky. Maybe you'll get a position somewhere that will pay you a salary, but even this, you cannot count on." But I am realistic with them. It's important to have some kind of career counseling aspect to what you're doing.

Now, the second point -- I don't know who received my outline and who did not, but the second point, the difficulties. Coming back to these difficulties, the main one that I have identified for myself is the cultural problems just dealing with this in 20th century society in the United States.

The first thing I'd like to point out is that about ten years ago, there was very little talk about wooden boat building. Those of you who were around in the museum stuff then know that this is true. There was suddenly a big interest in various crafts, and wooden boat building is one of them. The journal Wooden Boat now has, I think, a subscription of 180,000

people or something, which I find astonishing. But it's true, and that means there are a lot more people who are also readers of this and who are interested in it.

So, what we have essentially is a social movement. We have a bunch of people who for some reason want to do this now, whereas they didn't want to do it before. Because of this and because of the way things works in the United States -- and, by the way, even in Europe -- is that people come to us very often with sort of a package mentality, like, you know, "The package I have chosen is wooden boat building, so I need to wear these kinds of clothes. I need to sing a few sea chanteys -- in other words, it's appearance-based. They are focused on the sizzle, what they think is going on. They think, "Yes, these guys are having a great time." And we are just sweating in there, working away. But they think this is romantic and these are really real, real people, and they're doing a wonderful thing and all that.

So, the difficulty we have -- and I am not saying these people are not going to make it, but I am saying we better straighten out the illusions right away or we are in for some serious problems. So, the first thing you do is some prolonged interviewing to

find out whether you can sense whether they have a feel for this at all.

No. 1, we have many programs; some are for hobbiests. I am giving my remarks concerning a professional program, an apprenticeship program. So, in the professional program, we are not as interested in the hobbiest sort. We are looking for this person, this chance that maybe some of these people will be there 20 years from now, let's say. So we are trying to identify who that person is.

Of course, there are some great giveaways. People say the oddest things when they come to see you about this sort of thing. Do you know who Bob Prophreau is? He runs a fine school up in the Northwest, and he is sort of a very traditional, very hard teacher, you see.

A young man came to my shop a while back, he knocks on the door, and he says, "I want to see Mr. Darr." I said, "I am Mr. Darr." He says, "Well, is your father here?" I said, "No, he is in Tahiti, where he should be. And I am here, and I am running the program." He says, "Well, I am a disciple of Bob Prophreau." I had to draw blood from my inner lips to prevent being a bad host to this man."

[Laughter]

MR. BOB DARR: Of course, I immediately said to him -- because I know Bob. I have worked with Bob Prophreau. He is the sort of guy who frames a big schooner in eight hours, of course, because one simply does not do framing in more than eight hours. So, you're sweating the whole time and it's just incredibly difficult, let's put it that way. And a fine, fine boat builder, a fine teacher, but hard, old school.

I said, "Well, I have worked with Bob, but I didn't know he was giving spiritual teachings now." This was enough. The guy sort of picked up that I was maybe making fun of him a bit. So, he says, "Well, what are you doing at this at your age," or something to do with my age. I said, "Well, give me time. People like you will take care of that."

[Laughter]

MR. BOB DARR: But the point is that there are so many misconceptions, and you have these bubbles, these giant bubbles, and they're colored bubbles, and students are living in them. You have to pop these bubbles. It's not difficult to do this, given some time. But what you'd like to do is to identify who these people are in advance, because if you have a program like ours, we take six students at a time, and they're on a revolving system. There is an overlap,

which I recommend highly, meaning they don't all start at the same time. It's not necessary in our field. We are teaching something that is hands-on. So, as long as you cover everything in a year, you can have an overlap.

But if we only teach six students at a time, then we have to be sure we have the right people. At least, that is how I see it. Now, we also offer a hobbiest class -- these are my anti-fascist remarks here -- we also do offer, for those people who merely want to be entertained with this, or who think it's a wonderful thing and it's relaxing -- they have a hard job in front of the computer or something -- many of these people are benefitted from this sort of activity as a hobby.

I think in some ways, as a hobby, this is more important training than for the professional stuff, because it can be done on Mars. So we go to Mars. Great. The people still want to work with their hands. This is in our hands. We have gone back hundreds of thousands of years using our hands with tools, and, believe it or not, there are people who have talent because it's in them. They know what they're doing. It's in their hands. They know how to do that. It's part of being human. And here they are in a culture

that doesn't recognize this very much. And so these people, the dreamers, are dissatisfied. I am with them. I think, yes, I am glad you're dissatisfied. I hope you're dissatisfied. But also we've got to get over the misconceptions so that we can get you to where you could even earn your living instead of dreaming about it or being involved in the wrong thing with it.

So, it's very important that we give them the right sort of attitude counseling. Part of it includes making fun -- like I have been doing occasionally here -- of attitudes that we don't think work. You see, the guruist thing is very damaging, as one example. Old does not necessarily mean better. It has to be the right craftsman. Old means -- older craftsman means a craftsman who hopefully has more experience. We hope that is true, but it's not always true. Maybe they are bad experiences. Or maybe they can't teach. So you get these disasters that have happened in this movement along those lines, where people don't have their expectations met. What they really want is an older craftsman with sort of a long flowing beard to hold them by the hand and take them through this jungle of apprenticeship. It's not that way.

It's, more than anything, self-study. We have

the vessels in?" If they're not in good condition, then we have to ask why. And part of it is the budget, but maybe it's how we are spending the money. Maybe we have the wrong guy working on it. Or maybe we should invest some money in training so we have the guys who do it the way we want for these vessels. I don't care whether we are talking about new boat building, restoration, maintenance, painting, or whatever. I think this is something that has to be addressed by those of you who are actually directing museums and other projects.

Now, we are talking still about difficulties here, and one of them, of course, is the financial one. To set up a school like this, I have found that if one does not have the right equipment or the right facility, there is a lot of complaining. In other words, you must have enough money to even begin doing something like this so that so you don't frustrate the people who are coming in, so they don't have reason to become bitter. They're already going to find it very hard -- that is right out, that is the first thing they notice two months later, is "My muscles hurt and this is hard work. What happened to the big dream?" You have to wean them from that. You have get them to the point where they're satisfied by their ability. But

there is a hard stage in between. That stage is that their dreams aren't the same thing as reality, and you have to get them on to the nice part of reality which is going to happen later for them. They are going to learn a lot more later, they're going to be satisfied by the work. There is a tremendous amount being offered in this profession for personal satisfaction. One reason a lot of people stay in it is because they would not want to do anything else. It's that simple. They don't care that they're making $10 an hour or whatever it is, $5 an hour or whatever. They adjust their overhead to match this.

But it is important, if people are paying you money, which in our case that's what's happening -- they're paying a tuition -- that the facility is absolutely adequate. It's very important that there is trust in the facility is what I am getting at; it's not like they're getting shortchanged or something. So, it's very important that the facility itself is the right size, has the right equipment, and has a budget to carry on the activities and pay the instructors.

I mentioned the point earlier about the instructors being qualified to teach. There are some craftsmen, I have found -- we have hired some older craftsmen to teach, and it hasn't worked out. We had

no problem with them, but students had some serious problems with some of them. I feel it's my responsibility to find out why. Why didn't this work out? And usually it's the older way of doing things versus the new, the old apprenticeship system versus what we claim to be offering, which is simply different ways of doing things.

So, what we try to do there, if we are going to have somebody who we know is a great craftsman but possibly not a great teacher is that we arrange for them to do something which is mostly hands-on, where students can mainly help, or we don't use this person again, or whatever it is.

Now, it's also important that the program be of a certain size, meaning not too small and not too large. There is a critical mass thing that goes on. In my opinion, if you're going to spend the money and actually set up a program, a skills training program, it should be based on a minimum of four students. Also I believe, in any one place, the maximum ought to be eight or nine students. I can't remember -- Gus, how many students does Lance have in each shop when it used to be in the two shops?

FROM THE FLOOR: The apprentice shop and restoration shop each had eight. Then they were

combined. Then there were 12, and most of us really, there was always the shop and administration wanting to increase the number and the students wanting to decrease the number.

MR. BOB DARR: Yes. Because, you see, you want to increase the number if you're in administration because money is coming in. You need the income, or you need to get the work done, whatever it is. But students will always tell you -- listen to the students. It's very important. They will say, "Look, there is no room and there is only one teacher." There should be one teacher for every six students, or something, or, maximum, every eight students should be one teacher.

This gets to be expensive. You can already hear it, can't you? It's expensive to do this. So you may possibly find that you have to combine it with other things. What we do is take on commissions. And the instructor is building these boats and we are selling them. Bob Prophreau does the same thing. I believe the apprentice shop occasionally does the same thing, sells the boats that they are building to help pay for this.

So, the size is very important. We have had times in the past, because of difficulties in moving

and so forth, where we have gotten it down to two students. It's really awful, because if they aren't motivated, there is not a large enough group for feedback. Like one guy comes in and he's lazy that day. He doesn't have a lot of people to compare himself to, to see that, "Oh, I see. There is a lot going on here. I have to do my share. And these people are doing it, so" -- I mean, it's a mass psychology, if you will. It's important that you have enough people to have it work. Yet if you get too many people, it doesn't work. So, size is very important.

Now, there are exceptions to this, as always. Possibly what you have done is you have hired a craftsman to do some restoration and you wish to train somebody that you have so they know some more, but you know that he can only handle two trainees. That is perfectly acceptable. You're talking about a particular job and it's not going to go on for a long time or whatever. But if you are in fact sitting down and intending to start a program, my recommendion is that you do consider size as being very, very important.

The curriculum must be flexible so that it can fit individual needs. Another problem with size is that if you have too many people in the program, you

can't pay attention to differences in their ability. This is an apprentice, and, by definition, it means that you are always on a one-to-one with whoever is there. And that means that if there are six people there, your energy is given out in that way. It is sort of fanned out. So you come over to so-and-so and you realize that he needs something completely different from another student. And in order to avoid the problems that may seem to arise because of that, you have to discourage competition somehow. The best way is to try to get students to have the attitude that they're competing with their own limitations. But it's very important that they are not competing, like "I'm going to be the better boat builder than so-and-so." So, what you do is say, "look, we know where you're at" -- this particular student. "I know that what you really need right now is more work with your hand tools, then to do some dovetails." I will go to somebody who has already been a woodworker before he came in -- some people come in as woodworkers, cabinet makers, furniture makers -- and that person needs something a lot different. So, you have to cater to the individual needs or it's really not fair to anyone. It's important that they understand when they came in, we are not taking you all in at the same level. We are

taking you in as individuals to fit into our program. So, this is ought to be emphasized somewhere.

Now, the last section on this outline is called "finding real students." We have talked about ways of doing that. One thing that is helpful is, of course, to do some kind of advertising, meaning that part of your budget has to include some kind of advertising to draw people to you. Pretty soon, you get a word-of-mouth network going, and people come to you anyway and say, "Oh, I have heard about you and I want to see what you have to offer."

At that point, you are looking for certain characteristics in a person. And I can say without too much hesitation that usually the people who would succeed at whatever it is, you see -- there are people who are used to achieving. Those people do well in our field. People who are normal, as people go, who are fairly well adjusted, who are not psychotic and so forth, these people do best in our sorts of programs. What I do is say, "What have you been doing with your time?" Oddly enough, you would be surprised to know that most people who apply are not 18. You know, the old apprenticeship thing, such as the way I came into it, was that you are starting as a teenager. But nowadays, we get people who are in their 20's -- they

are 25, 28, 30, and so forth, which delights me, because I know they have already seen that the world is not the way it's supposed to be, it's not a handout. So they came to you knowing that you put in or you don't get.

What I say is, "What have you been doing with your time?" And if they have had 30 occupations in the last ten years or something, I am leery. Experience shows that we are just another love affair with something, you see. But if you find out that they have achieved something, it's helpful. Like they were an ace mountain climber or they have a degree in English and they did some writing and it was serious. It's not sufficient. You want them to have some woodworking experience. But this is more talking. I am talking about their character. It's more important that you try to establish that there is some persistence in their character. You may be wrong and they might be wrong. They might come into your program and try it and then may decide that, "Oh, this is what it's really about? This is awful." Well, that is fine. They have learned their lesson. We have found out. We have saved time for everyone. But if you have identified them as achievers and persistent people, then if they like it, they go on, and ten years later you know

people who you're working with now as an equal in the shop as another craftsman and you remember, "Oh, it's been ten years and I trained this person and they are still here. That's wonderful. There is a reason for me to do this after all."

Anyway, that is briefly what this is all about. I'd be happy to take any questions. I cannot stay for the panel, but can stay for another ten minutes or so and answer any questions that people have.

MR. PETER STEELE: How many programs similar to yours approximately are there in North America?

MR. BOB DARR: There may be somebody better qualified to answer that for us. Does anybody know how many small programs there are? I think that there are a couple of dozen.

FROM THE FLOOR: More like 50.

MR. BOB DARR: I am sorry?

FROM THE FLOOR: More like 50.

MR. BOB DARR: Apparently there are about 50 small programs -- with different goals, mind you. You'll talk to another guy and he'll say, "Why does he care so much about this professional program business? We want to help people learn to use their hands and have a good time." There are all kinds of programs. I

don't know how many of them are intended to train professional boat builders or restoration people who may help you. But I think there is somewhere -- I think even Wooden Boat magazine catalogued one time the different boat schools. For your own sakes, I do think it's a good resource. I do think that some of these schools are a good resource, especially if they have a track record, if they have been in business for several years. It does take two or three years to work out the problems in any training school.

MR. PETER NEILL: Of your apprentices, give or take, what's been the percentage that have gone on to teach, gone on to make their living from the trade, gone on to some new, other task?

MR. BOB DARR: Of the people who are accepted by the program, 20 percent, approximately, leave the program. And of the remainder, of the people who stay in the program, they stay through the whole program, and about another 20 percent or so almost immediately do something else, in my experience.

What they will do is build boats on the side, maybe, as a hobby, but a lot of times they are broke; they need money. So they will go in and do kitchen cabinets, and they'll say, "Oh, this is easy," and they keep doing that. So you notice that five years later

their little detour in kitchen cabinets is permanent, for example.

After five years, I would say we only have about 25 or 30 percent of our students in the trade -- and really in it, I mean, though. They're perfectly comfortable and capable in that trade. I think that is something that is a very important thing to look at. If we are trying to calculate something nationally about what may happen in 20 years, we do have to look at not only our odds, but somebody else's odds -- other schools. Somebody needs to do a study, in other words, and say to such-and-such a school, "Can you tell us how many of your people are really doing this and actually making a living doing it?" If we can find out what percentage that is, then we can find out the number of students nationally and we can predict these things.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Could you give us an insight into your annual budget, how much of that comes from earned revenues, tuition, sales of boats versus contributions. I guess we can figure out what the cost per student is today.

MR. BOB DARR: I don't know if I mentioned this, but the students pay, just for the other side of it, the students pay $3,000 for the year. My understanding is that that is fairly reasonable

compared to some of the other programs. They are more or less the same, $3,000. So, with six students, that is only $18,000 a year.

Our expenses run at about $80,000 a year. So, how do we do it? Well, we are able to complete about 50 to $60,000 a year in work, you see. We are lucky in that some of the designers on the West Coast have favored us and have given us contracts. This is very nice.

And again, the thing to point out here is that if you're not doing fiberglass, you're not doing plywood boats, or whatever, you may as well dig in and focus on quality. Because after all, the only people left who are going to come to you are the people who want quality. So you actually develop a market by focusing in that direction.

So, one example is, there is a designer that you may have heard of, Lyle Hess. We do everything exactly the way he wants, better than what he wants. And then when he comes to see the boats, he is absolutely delighted. And then the next guy who writes him from Saudi Arabia, Alaska, Canton, London, wherever, he says, "Oh, I like these guys. They know what they're doing."

We are very careful with our relationship with

him, too. If somebody inquires, we say, "We will have you purchase the plans from Lyle Hess." You have to do some PR work that way.

We also, to finish the business about funding, we receive funding from the San Francisco Foundation. And being in Marin County, we are lucky. We have a wealthy foundation. But even though they're wealthy, they only give us about $12,000 a year, from $12,000 to $24,000 a year, depending on different years and how it's gone. Lately, they have been giving us a little more, closer to 20.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Does that make up your deficit?

MR. BOB DARR: What we do is, we do have a deficit, as you've maybe figured out. Because when we started out, we did start out, and I even put up -- the different people on the board, it's a nonprofit corporation. Different people on the board said, "Well, yes. This is a great idea, Bob. Here is some money." Some people said, "Here's a loan." Some people said, "Here it is for you," and so forth.

The San Francisco Foundation does not allow you to use money on your deficit. So you can only apply money from many foundations to current programs. You'll find that is often the rule.

So, what we do, of course, is simply arrange our programs to look as though we are using their money to pay for our current programming. It should appear to you that we are a very small school. This particular operation is very small. That is true. I am the main full-time instructor, and then we hire other part-time instructors, and some of the instructors are not paid as instructors; they're paid as boat builders.

One of the advantages of having boat building projects going on is that you can hire people of excellence. We have Bruce Northrup working with us right now. He is planking one of the 32-footers. He was one of Pete Cullar's main proteges and is considered a very fine boat builder. And my experience so far is that he is. And he is a good teacher, too.

So, he is not on salary, yet he's teaching, because we send advanced apprentices to work with him. They save him money on his bid. He makes his bid. He teaches. And the center takes money off the top of those jobs, you see, as overhead expenses.

One more question. This man had his hand up so long -- excuse me. Do you still have your question.

MR. DAVID WALKER: It really isn't a question. It's a statement. It just occurred to me. American

and Canadian shipyards are in trouble at the moment, and there may be a source of shipwright welding, joining tradesmen who have gone through a long system of training, having the availability of them over the next few years.

MR. BOB DARR: I am sorry. They have what?

MR. DAVID WALKER: They may be available.

MR. BOB DARR: Yes, you are right. You are right.

MR. DAVID WALKER: The major shipyards are really in trouble.

MR. BOB DARR: Yes. And as shipyards close, you get qualified people, qualified as craftsmen, and in some cases qualified as teachers. Those people would be obvious people to choose to come into a program such as a museum program.

One last thing I didn't mention about the economics of it is that I think it's useful for those of us who are building boats to market them. After all, everyone else is doing this. This is the USA. So, what we have done to make sure that we can provide for our own graduates, as well as having a placement program, is that we have designed our own boats so that we can put them into shows -- this is a new program; we are in the process of doing this -- with the belief

that if somebody loves that boat, they will simply have to come to us, because it's our design and our yard and so forth.

So then somebody comes to us and we have a surplus of work, naturally we are trying to give it to graduates. I guess that is it on time. Thank you very much. I hope the rest of the program goes well for you.

[Applause]

MODERATOR McGRATH: We will get set up here. The bus is coming at 4:45. It has to leave at 5:00 o'clock. You know, you can negotiate with the bus driver.

Before I turn over the microphone, I am going to do one final, last act. There is a panel. There are a lot of people who think they belong here. Fine. There were people here this morning. I would like to ask the one individual who -- we wouldn't be here if it wasn't for his lifelong dedication and work -- before everybody else starts fighting for chairs, Karl Kortum, if you could come up here and sit here. We would really like to have you right in the center.

[Applause]

FROM THE FLOOR: Speaking for myself, I am really tired and dozey. How about a five-minute

stretch?

MR. DAVID WALKER: Could we have a show of hands for our mentor, Tom.

[Applause]

MODERATOR McGRATH: Let's get ready to get going. We may come back. Once again, I will step down. Dave, before you leave, one thing. Thanks a lot.

[Applause]

MODERATOR McGRATH: Vince, can you hear me?

[Laughter]

MODERATOR McGRATH: Vince, if you have any business cards, I would hand them out. This guy has done an absolutely amazing job as far as I am concerned. We have a bidding war going on between APT and the Trust for the publication rights. Only kidding. Only kidding. You know, the whole spirit of this thing is that we are doing it all together. And maybe we are proving that maritime work can be profitable, that a session like this can make money, to further our work. It was all due to Vince, who really steered us in the right direction. Thanks a lot, Vince.

And Jim Delgado. Can you come up, sit up here so the archeologists don't take potshots at us in

January in Sacramento.

MR. DAVID BRINK: If we could have the folks who worked on this revision, and then we will sit down, and with the time left, the speakers can have at it.

After we went sailing, and while we missed, unfortunately, the talk about Mystic's maintenance work, we went in the back room and hit our quick, handy-dandy computer again, and from your suggestions earlier this morning, we revised again, on blue paper, the document that we are working on for our standards.

The first and most noticeable change is, of course, on the title page, with the word "management."

The next and very important thing was that we took Item No. 10 in the old document, the first draft, and we moved it up to the top as the introductory paragraph. I don't know if we changed that. Does anyone remember. We didn't change that.

Then we decided to do some definitions of terms which follow. And I'd like to read those.

"Management of historic vessels shall be seen as a process which includes a series of inclusive steps as follows:

"DOCUMENTATION is defined as the process of researching and recording all historic data relevant to the structure, function, and history of the vessel."

You have not seen that before. Is there any comment? Everyone likes that.

"STABILIZATION is defined as the process of applying measures designed to re-establish weather- and water-tight integrity, to assure structural stability, and to arrest further deterioration of a vessel. The essential form of a vessel shall be maintained during this process."

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: On documentation, it says "historic data." Does that exclude modern data or ongoing data?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Or technical data?

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: Yes. Data on changes, alterations, et cetera.

MR. DAVID BRINK: How about if we take out "historic"?

MR. KARL KORTUM: No. Leave it in. Add the other.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Add the other? How about if --

MR. PETER NEILL: Just "data." You don't have historic data. Historic data is usually outdated anyway. You have data about history, you have data --

MR. GARY HUME: Relevant data.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Relevant data.

MR. STEPHEN HASTINGS: Question. Does everyone read that to include the documentation of work that we are doing on that vessel? Does that adequately make a statement that that is identifying the documentation as well?

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Steve, I believe it's recording all relevant data, not only researching, but just recording it as well. Maybe that is a wording problem.

MR. DAVID WALKER: Continuing process,?

MR. KARL KORTUM: Why don't you put the word "technical" in as well as historic?

FROM THE FLOOR: Or "data relevant to the structure, function, maintenance and history of the vessel. Or ongoing participation.

MR. DAVID BRINK: If I may have a moment with our group here. Maintenance?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: "Maintenance" is good.

MR. GARY HUME: Structure, function, maintenance, and history.

MR. DAVID BRINK: "Maintenance" is better than "management" because --

MS. GLENNIE WALL: Yes. Because we are talking about recording.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay. Is everyone happy?

"STABILIZATION is defined as the process of applying measures designed to re-establish weather- and water-tight integrity, to assure structural stability, and to arrest further deterioration of a vessel. The essential form of the vessel shall be maintained during this process."

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: I think we should try and possibly say, in some cases, stabilization is going to be easy. Flat bottom dory, slide up on the skid and block it. This one, a little bit more difficult.

You ought to try to get some kind of a word in here, essential form of the vessel shall be maintained or retained, or somehow -- what I am trying to say is: Don't get it to go any further -- maximum effort to make sure that you don't lose the shape any more than it may already be in.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Is there comment from the table here?

MR. DON BIRKHOLZ: I will address that. That is what we mean by "assure structural stability." To assure the structural stability means you're --

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: Okay. I'll buy that, Don.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Don is supposed to be up here, by the way.

MR. DON BIRKHOLZ: You can hear me, right?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Any other questions on that point? Any other comment?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I think to maintain or reestablish. This implies it has --

MR. GARY HUME: Now, "reestablish," I think, would come under one of the other treatments.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: To maintain would come under one of the other treatments?

MR. GARY HUME: No. To "reestablish" would come under one of the other treatments. So, that wouldn't be a part of stabilization.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: Do we want to delete reestablish from stabilization?

FROM THE FLOOR: I agree with that.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I think stabilization needs to include it. We want to maintain as well as secure.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Walter.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I would suggest stabilization consist of -- the essential form of the vessel should be maintained. I think just the way it's written is quite adequate. I think if you imply original form or regaining -- if you say "maintained or regained," that implies a restoration process. I think just the way it is right here will cover what's

necessary.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: Reestablish?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: No, not even reestablish.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: My copy says "re-establish." Is there something wrong with it?

MR. STEVE HYMAN: "Re-establish" is referring to the "weather- and water-tight integrity," which in most cases, even our active vessels, is going to have to be reestablished.

MR. DON BIRKHOLZ: I can use an example to clarify this. Take Wapama, for instance. If we put a cover over Wapama that reestablishes the watertight integrity, we maintain that essential form of the vessel -- you don't destroy the vessel to stabilize it. You can always take the cover off. The Wapama is still there.

So maybe the term "retain" should have been inserted there rather than "maintain." We are not talking about maintaining, just retaining the historic fabric and form of the vessel.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I agree with that. Steve.

FROM THE FLOOR: How about, just insert "maintain" before "re-establish"? "Designed to maintain or re-establish weather- and water-tight" structure? If you got it, you don't need to

reestablish it.

MR. DAVID BRINK: "Maintain or re-establish." Then, in the last sentence, "the essential form of the vessel shall be retained during this process"?

MR. PETER NEILL: You don't need the last sentence.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Just take it out.

MR. PETER NEILL: Take it out.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Everyone agree?

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Now read it.

MR. GARY HUME: No. I think you've lost something if you drop that last sentence.

MR. DORIAN TRAVERS: I think that the last statement is very applicable, because someone could take a vessel apart to stabilize it.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Do we have agreement?

MR. DAVID WALKER: If someone has to take it apart to stabilize it, then so be it. We should be able to allow it.

MR. KARL KORTUM: They tend not to get back together again.

FROM THE FLOOR: Could you read the revised statement.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Okay.

"STABILIZATION is defined as the process of

applying measures designed to maintain or re-establish weather- and water-tight integrity, to assure structural stability, and to arrest further deterioration of a vessel. The essential form of the vessel shall be retained during this process."

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I agree.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Comment?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I agree. That last sentence needs to be in there.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Suds?

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: Yes. Now that you have explained what you've trying to say, it's very clear. But when I read it cold, it didn't come across. I think the commas are off. The words are all there, but the commas are wrong.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Mr. Neill is in charge of the commas.

[Laughter]

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: Don says that to assure structural stability is what we are trying to do. I was leading to it. I agree with him. However, placed in that sentence, what your sentence really says is that you're applying measures which are designed to reestablish weather- and water-tight integrity. Right? You are using whatever measures necessary to maintain

and reestablish water- and weather-tight integrity.

The reason you're doing it is to ensure its structural stabililty and to arrest further deterioration of the vessel.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I would put a slightly different reading on that. I think to assure structural stability is another goal which might be in addition to reestablishing weather- and water-tight integrity, because very often blocking --

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: I agree. Because once it was explained to me what you trying to say --

MR. WALTER RYBKA: No. I think that does communicate in the sentence. But what I would suggest is: In order to arrest further deterioration of the vessel. That makes it clear that all the foregoing are processes leading to.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: All right.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Any other comments on that point?

MR. KARL KORTUM: I suppose shipworms are included under "water-tight integrity"?

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Yes.

MR. KARL KORTUM: The assualt of the teredoes?

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I would say caulking, worm damage, decay, any type of deterioration, Karl.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Fumigation. All right.

"PRESERVATION is defined as the process of applying measures to maintain the existing form, integrity, and material of a vessel and its associated equipment."

There is a very interesting point here, because I want you to know that the two land-base people in this committee suggested "gear," and the maritime people changed it to "equipment." I just want to make that footnote clear.

[Laughter]

MR. JAMES DELGADO: What exactly do we mean by integrity in this case? Are we talking about form and material, and integrity is those? Or are we talking about something different?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Integrity, for example, could be cutting holes in the side of the ship to make a restaurant out of it, maybe.

MR. JIM DELGADO: I guess what I am saying is that I have always defined integrity as being maintaining form and material.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: And craftsmanship.

MR. JIM DELGADO: And craftsmanship. If it's going to be broken, maybe it should be broken down. Integrity is all those things, I'd say.

MR. DAVID BRINK: So, we might say: Maintaining the integrity of form, craftsmanship, and materials. Something like that?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: That would be good.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay.

MR. KARL KORTUM: Would "form" in that case cover the door cut in the side of the Cutty Sark, which should not be there, in my opinion?

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I tend to agree with Karl on that point, that integrity is basically what we are discussing here, I think, is the intactness of the vessel.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I would agree, yes. We are talking about "integrity" as defined as original craftsmanship, original material, and original form, perhaps.

MR. KARL KORTUM: Why don't we use Steve's word, "intactness." That is a pretty good word.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Steve?

FROM THE FLOOR: I think integrity refers to the relationship of materials, if it's still in its original place, which is a point not otherwise addressed.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Yes.

MR. KARL KORTUM: I like "intactness." I

think that's a good word. It's different from "form" and it's different from "material," and it covers the door cut in the side.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Are we suggesting that we say something like, "Preservation is defined as the process of applying measures to maintain the integrity of intactness, form, and craftsmanship and material"?

MR. KARL KORTUM: No. "Intactness" is just one of that string of words.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Is "intactness" a word?

MR. KARL KORTUM: It works. It's a word.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I used it.

MR. KARL KORTUM: It's a word.

[Laughter]

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I think "integrity" covers it. I think it's understood, if you say "integrity of form, craftsmanship and material."

MR. KARL KORTUM: "Integrity" is overused.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: "Integrity" is the word that is best used.

MR. GARY HUME: How about saying, "Applying measures to maintain intact the existing form and material, craftsmanship of the vessel."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Yes.

FROM THE FLOOR: Do you want "original"

instead of "existing"? Existing might not be original.

MR. GARY HUME: We are talking about preservation, preserving what we've got, not restoring. So, we are talking about what is there.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Could you read it now.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: As I have it now, and correct me if I miss any.

"PRESERVATION is defined as the process of applying measures to maintain intact the existing form, integrity, and material of a vessel and its associated equipment."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Walter?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Yes.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Does everyone like that?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Craftsmanship.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Do you want to include craftsmanship.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: The craftsmanship is implicit in the material and the way it's been used.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: No. I don't think that is the case. That is not the case, Steve. Material would be iron plate, steel plate, oak frames, things of that sort. Craftsmanship is the way in which it's put together.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: If we maintain that

material, we have maintained the form of that material. We have also maintained the examples of craftsmanship. but I think we address craftsmanship in other standards here.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Comment on that point?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think for preservation, it's covered by implication here. I think for preservation, or where the other processes are going to be gone through, you need to state "craftsmanship" separately.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I will accept that.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We have a consensus? Okay.

"RESTORATION is defined as the process of accurately recovering the form and details of a vessel and its associated equipment as it appeared at a particular time by removal of later work or the replacement of missing earlier work."

FROM THE FLOOR: You need a comma after "time."

MR. DAVID BRINK: We need one? Okay.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: "At a particular time," comma, "by removal"?

FROM THE FLOOR: Right.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Is it implicit here that replacement of missing earlier work will be in-kind?

Or are we leaving that open?

MR. DAVID BRINK: I think that is covered -- good question.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: Typically we wouldn't require in-kind in a land-base structure. I am not sure you want to do that.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I would say that we have covered additions or new materials in other standards.

MR. DAVID WALKER: The word "accurately" on the first line covers that, too. You're doing it with accuracy when you're doing it.

FROM THE FLOOR: David, I think it should read: "Removal of later work and/or the replacement of missing earlier work."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay. Agreement there? Stephen?

FROM THE FLOOR: A question to --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Wait, wait. Let's stay on this point. "And/or." Is there agreement about that or any objection to that? Okay. It's "and/or." Now, Stephen.

MR. STEPHEN HASTINGS: Question. Steve Hastings, National Maritime Museum. Is this definition in conflict with NPS 28.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I don't know what NPS 28 is.

MR. GARY HUME: No, it's not.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: I don't think so. It's not.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Great. Any other comment?

"RECONSTRUCTION is defined as the process of reproducing in new construction the exact form and detail of a vanished vessel, maritime object, or any part thereof, as it appeared at a particular time."

FROM THE FLOOR: That's replication.

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: That's replication or -- no.

MR. DAVID BRINK: The exactness makes it a replica?

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: The reason we use "reconstruction" is because we use it. Why would replication be a better word? I guess that is what I would ask.

MR. NORMAN BROUWER: Do you want to just deal with replicas here or with replicas and reproductions?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: What's the difference?

MR. NORMAN BROUWER: A replica is an exact copy of something.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: And what is a reproduction?

MR. NORMAN BROUWER: A reproduction could be a type based on a type.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Pride of Baltimore is an example of a class.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: A class,

MR. DAVID BRINK: A class, a type, versus a particular one.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: What we are talking about here is putting in a new plank, right?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: No. That is something I wanted to bring up next, is that we are not covering repairs here.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: Right. You are not covering major repairs. What do they call a house, a historic house, that you have to take all the siding off, inside wall, plaster, lath, in order to replace a number of of the frames, put a new roof, a number of new roof trusses on, reroof it, put on some new outside siding on, some old outside siding on, all new plaster, destroy all the old plaster.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Isn't that restoration?

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: That's what I am saying. What is that?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I would call that restoration. Just the definition here says: Recovering the form and details of a vessel, associated equipment as it appeared. And it says "by removal of

later work or replacement of missing earlier work." It doesn't say here about repair or replacement of deficient existing work.

MR. DAVID BRINK: So, would you just like to add that right in there?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think it needs to be added. Otherwise we have no definition for the bulk of the work to be done.

MR. DAVID BRINK: So, would you rephrase it, please.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I'd simply make an addition to the very end, where it says, "By removal of later work and/or replacement of missing earlier work, or by the repair or replacement of existing work."

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Can we simplify that by saying, "by removal of later work and/or the" -- let's see.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: Replacement of existing deteriorating --

FROM THE FLOOR: Missing or deteriorating.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Good.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Take out "earlier."

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: That same process, I think, could be a part of preservation and also a part of stabilization. No?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: No, not necessarily, because stabilizing a structure I see as preventing further deterioration.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: What about preservation?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Preservation, yes. Preservation, just to hold it intact -- sometimes repairs are required.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: Of a major extent.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Yes. But under "preservation," it says it's the process of applying measures to maintain the form. And one of the measures might be partial replacement. So I think preservation is all right. I think we are covered now that we have addressed that.

MR. DAVID BRINK: All right. Let's have Steve read it.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I have: "RESTORATION is defined as the process of accurately recovering the form and details of a vessel and its associated equipment as it appeared at a particular time, by removal of later work and/or the replacement and repair of missing or deteriorated work."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay? Now are we back to reconstruction?

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: Let me just tell you about

what I think reconstruction means. As far as land-base structure, it means starting with nothing and duplicating the form and detail but not necessarily the construction techniques of a missing structure. So, in other words, the framing, the actual framing members, the material does not necessarily have to be in a historic manner, only the external appearance would be -- external materials, the finished materials would have the historic appearance. That is how we would define reconstruction.

FROM THE FLOOR: That, by common usage in the maritime trade, is replication.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: I think the situation we ran into, it would be more equivalent to building a tract of homes or a type or class of vessel.

FROM THE FLOOR: You are talking about making a house out of nothing, out of plans, of plans, drawings, pictures, of a house that existed before. Okay. In my usage, that is replication as far as a ship goes.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: The construction techniques would not necessarily be the same as they were, although the finished appearance would be.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Anybody have an objection to replication?

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: Well, I don't have a strong objection. The only thing I would ask you is to look forward as far as things like tax incentives or federal money and try and conform as much as possible to the terms we use. And you're doing that, in essence, anyway. Unless there is a strong feeling you have about another preference.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Gary.

MR. GARY HUME: Why don't we say "reconstruction," in parentheses, "replication."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Exactly what I was going to say.

MR. DAVID WALKER: We don't have a dictionary on the table?

MR. DAVID BRINK: It's all up here.

The suggestion is to put both terms there, one in brackets.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: There was another term, though, you had besides replication. What was that other term? Reproduction was another one. How does that fit in?

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: I always thought what you described was reproduction, and the one that includes the skills and techniques was the one that was replication.

And my question for you is, did you guys abandon that or what?

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: We never used that word historically since 1930, that I know of.

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Really?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Excuse me. People have their hands up and other people are just talking out. If we could maintain a little order. If you want to speak, please put your hand up.

Walter.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think the difference between replication and reconstruction or reproduction is not too important for standards for historic vessels, which implies vessels already in existence. Where this difference comes in, I think, is when you're talking about new construction in the overall preservation field, and there, I think, the definitions that we discussed the other day were between reproduction and replicas, where enough information exists to know that you're reproducing it in exactitude and you do follow that with methods including the internal frame and structural arrangements.

A reproduction is where you don't have the information to duplicate an exact vessel. It's generic. It's a type of vessel.

I don't know that that is important for restoration standards, because in this sense you are already talking about an existing structure. So maybe we could keep the word "reconstruction" for conformity and not have any problem with it.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: You have a concept there which I am interested in. That is, reproducing a vessel in every way exactly as it was historically, if that is possible -- I am not sure that is possible, even. That is a concept we don't deal with. If that is an important one for vessels, then maybe you should explore that a little.

MR. JIM DELGADO: I think it is possible. Carol Olsen might to able to answer this. But I believe Texas A&M, working with some Greek shipwrights, more or less accurately reproduced the construction method and material of the Correnia ship.

Isn't that correct, Carol?

MS. CAROL OLSEN: I couldn't hear you.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I was talking about the sailing production of the Correnia ship. Was that not done in a form which reproduced original construction technique and method as well as material?

MS. CAROL OLSEN: Yes. It was done by Greek shipyards.

MR. DAVID BRINK: John.

FROM THE FLOOR: That's already been done in the Nonsuch, as close as they can come back down to hemp rope.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Stephen.

FROM THE FLOOR: It's certainly important in small craft and, you know, larger craft where you have a situation of a deteriorated vessel and you build another one alongside it that is strictly reproduction.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Yes, Peter.

MR. PETER STEELE: Is it necessary that the vessel, object, or part be vanished before it can be reproduced or reconstructed.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Good point.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: The Park Service definition says that although parts of the original structure are sometimes utilized, substantial quantities of new construction materials are usually involved.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I think that is fine, but that doesn't mean vanished. Vanished means gone. I think we just strike it.

MR. KARL KORTUM: It seems to me that what Randy says about putting up a new house -- say a row of houses is needed in some historical scene, but they wouldn't go into the detail of having the same joists

and studs and so on as were in the original, because the outside surface is what they're working for, is what they're trying to achieve. And money, I suppose, is the reason.

So, as I understand his description of reconstruction, that is what is done there -- that is, in my opinion, parallel to a standard type of maritime activity in which the frames of the ship are glued up of many layers. Perhaps we should make clear that reconstruction allows these things to happen and then finally put in replication as being a very exact or maybe even use the word "exact replication."

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think there is probably very little difference between --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Raise your hand.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Sorry.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Walter.

[Laughter]

MR. DAVID BRINK: This is for the record. It gets confusing.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Agreed. I think there is a value to having a definition of exact replica, because for certain processes or projects, it is important to make the distinction that an exact process is being followed. So I would submit that we include a

definition of replication as being exact in all detail, interior or internal, as well as external to the original, and that we have that in addition to the definition of reconstruction.

I think for the sake of conformity, I don't know that we need a separate definition between reconstruction and reproduction.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: I think we do. I can envision -- the word "reconstruction" is fairly well defined outside the maritime community and outside National Park Service definitions as something that -- you took apart, a deckhouse off, set it aside. You got four sides and then the deck and the benches and the chart table in the pilot house at one time. Five or six years later, you reconstruct this pilot house, put it back on a ship.

Now, you reconstructed that original pilot house. There is nowhere that allows, in the definition, allows you to have the pieces and allows you to rebuild it once you taken it apart in any of our definitions.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Isn't that what we would have meant by restoration?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Restoration.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Walter, do I understand that

you are suggesting a separate category for replication?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Yes.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Then would you suggest that we strike "reconstruction" in this paragraph and substitute "replication"? Is that -- if I understand that correctly.

MR. KARL KORTUM: No. It should be separate.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Karl and Walter both are suggesting that we have another definition, which is "replication." And I agree with --

MR. STEVE HYMAN: What I am saying, Jim, is that we use this definition, "reconstruction," as we have "replication," because we are talking about exact form and detail.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Yes. As written here, this might better be described as -- this is what I would consider to be a good definition of a replica, because it says "exact form and detail."

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Is there a consensus on that?

MR. KARL KORTUM: I don't think we should lose "reconstruction."

MR. STEVE HYMAN: No, Karl. We will do another, separate paragraph.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Excuse me. If I could

interrupt the process just for a moment. It is now 18 minutes of 5:00. The bus is to be loaded at 5:00 o'clock. We are going to stall the bus driver 15 minutes. But at this rate, we are not going to get through this. I am sorry to rush you, but I am going to ask that we be as brief and relevant as possible so that we can get through this whole thing.

We are looking for consensus from this group on all these points.

MR. WILSON DULMAN: I move that we use this definition for "replication," add a definition for "reconstruction" which strikes the use of the word "exact" -- well, allows the substitution of different techniques and different internal construction. The verbiage can be worked out at a later time. In other words, that we use a similar definition but drop the requirement.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Drop "exact detail"?

MR. WILSON DULMAN: "Exact detail," yes. You are concerned about form.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Form and appearance.

MR. WILSON DULMAN: That is correct.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Lynn.

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Walter, I have always called the Mayflower II, Dove, et cetera, Bill Baker's

best guess. So, where does that fit?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think they would have to be considered reconstructions or reproductions.

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Reproductions.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Yes. Because we didn't have enough information to call it a replica.

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: What do you call it now?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think it would come under the new definition of "reconstruction" -- the form and appearance, but it might not be exact in every detail.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Stephen.

FROM THE FLOOR: In the definition of replications, should we not also mention craftsmanship and tools?

MR. GARY HUME: Could I suggest a definition for replication? Replication is defined as the process of reproducing in new construction the exact form, detail, construction methods and craftsmanship of a vessel as it appeared at a particular time.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Good. Everybody buys it?

FROM THE FLOOR: Materials?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Yes.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Materials. Are we agreed, then, on reconstruction as well?

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Did you put "repro" in

there?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Yes. We added it, right?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: No. That was replica. I don't know that we need a difference between reconstruction and reproduction.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We are just putting it, slash, right? No?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: No. Two separate definitions.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: We need one that allowed us to tag used pieces of a --

MS. GLENNIE WALL: That's reconstruction.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: That is replication that Gary just read. We need another definition for reconstruction.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: What Suds is talking about is reconstruction.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: And reconstruction, I believe, is what we said we would be reproducing in new construction, the form and appearance of a vessel, without specifying exact detail of technique, craftsmanship. Is that correct?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think what you're describing, Suds, is what the rest of us would consider restoration.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Moving right along.

MR. DAVID BRINK: "REHABILITATION is defined as the process of returning a vessel to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible a contemporary use, while prereserving those features of the vessel which are significant to its historic and cultural values."

Consensus.

"INTERPRETATION is defined as the process of conveying information to the public to enhance its understanding of the historical, cultural, and functional significance of a vessel."

Problem? Yes, John.

JOHN CONWAY: Not that one. I got something after that.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We are done with interpretation?

Peter?

MR. PETER STEELE: Sorry. I just have a question about -- back to rehabilitation. What do we mean by including the word "efficient contemporary use" -- the word "efficient," "which makes possible an 'efficient' contemporary use" -- is that a value we want to include?

MR. GARY HUME: It's not a word that I feel

wed to. We can drop it.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Scrap "efficient."

Bill. Karl.

MR. KARL KORTUM: In "Interpretation," the word "significance" is misspelled.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Thank you.

Strafford.

MR. STRAFFORD MORSS: On interpretation and significance of a vessel, are we not dealing with more than just vessels?

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Yes.

MR. STRAFFORD MORSS: "Vessel/facility," something of that nature?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I thought this was large museum ships, Strafford. We were just trying to deal with this one part of it now.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I have a question to the panel. Does it have to do with equipment and gear -- or gear?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Wouldn't that be implicit in a vessel as part of it?

MR. DAVID BRINK: That is why I am asking --

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Gear, furniture --

MR. GARY HUME: I would think it would be. It would be part of a vessel.

MR. DAVID BRINK: All right. Sorry, John.

MR. JOHN CONWAY: Before we leave the page, back up to the top of the top of the page, the last sentence, the last few words. I would like to see: Development of appropriate procedures and priorities for maritime heritage preservation, rather than just "maritime preservation." Maritime is at sea, not the ship --

MR. DAVID BRINK: "Maritime heritage preservation." Fine. Agreed? Okay.

Next page. No. 1.

"Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a vessel which requires minimal alteration of its historic structure and appearance."

We changed the word "historic," or added the word "historic."

MR. KARL KORTUM: Is that the way you spell "compatible"?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Well, we are not too good on spelling.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: That is really not important right now. We can fix it later.

MR. DAVID BRINK: No. 2.

"The distinguishing original qualities or

character of a vessel shall be retained whenever possible. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive features shall be avoided."

We turned that sort of negative statement into a positive one.

MR. DANA HEWSON: I think that is going to be awful limiting. I mean, even in a strict museum sense, I think you'd have trouble living with that. That just says "avoided" --

MR. JIM DELGADO: How about "if possible"?

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I think if we substitute "should" for "shall," you'll get a standard.

MR. DANA HEWSON: Yes.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Stephen.

FROM THE FLOOR: Avoidance is not a prohibition. One tends to avoid and tries to avoid, but it doesn't prohibit.

MR. DAVID BRINK: So, are you suggesting "if possible" would be --

FROM THE FLOOR: It's fine as it reads.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I would substitute "should" for "shall," as Glennie said.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Agreed? "Should" for "shall."

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: I'd ask you to look at the

should's and shall's throughout this thing. I think you'll find a number of those problems.

MR. GARY HUME: We may have to do some wordsmithing.

MR. DAVID BRINK: No. 3.

"All vessels shall be recognized as products of a historic period. Alterations that have had no historical basis relevant to that period shall be discouraged."

MR. JOHN CONWAY: Didn't we agree to say, "All vessels shall be recognized as products of their time"?

MR. DAVID BRINK: We did, and we discussed it further, and the consensus of the drafters was that we had a problem with "products of our own time," because almost every vessel we know in her own time, her history, has had a number of alterations. So you're therefore then talking about all those times and all those alterations.

I think we have also had quite a bit of discussion about picking a particular period, a significant period of time in a vessel's history. So we went back to that again. It's a good point to mention.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I think No. 3 and 4 work together, John.

MR. DAVID BRINK: John, did you have a question?

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: An addition, another sentence. "Except for those required for safety and security."

FROM THE FLOOR: Public access.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Well, I think that we should discourage those, but if they're necessary --

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: We were talking this morning about sprinkler systems, about ventilation, things you are going to need to do.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Wouldn't we cover that if we just said "should" again? They should be discouraged, and we realize in the statement "should," that there are going to be exceptions to the rule because of safety, public access, or other things. If you just said "should," I think it's a guideline.

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Simply to discourage them doesn't imply -- isn't a total prohibition.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Like "avoided," it's not a prohibition.

MR. DAVID BRINK: "Should"?

MS. LYNN HICKERSON: Just to make sure, that the bulkheading for the School Vessels Act won't conflict with being on these registers?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Same issue. We are talking about the same issue.

Does "should" seem to do it for you? We are all realizing that if you are going to turn a historic vessel into a school ship, you are going to have to make a lot of changes in it, and you made that decision for the health of the vessel.

John.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: I still think it would make it easier for people to understand, easier for them to do those things if they had it there, if it was said: Safety and security are a priority, and you can -- you do bend these rules?

MR. DAVID BRINK: Unfortunately, though, I don't think it's just safety and security. You have got a number of other factors.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think that is a nice umbrella, and it distinguishes alterations that are aimed at that. I think it costs us very little to add that, and I agree with John, it does increase the clarity, because it distinguishes the museum goal of having minimum alteration from the practical one of saying, "We are going to have to do a few things in the interest of safety."

MR. RICHARD ANDERSON: I tend to think that

since you're trying to deal with a general standard, maybe you ought to leave it as is and let the matters of safety and the rest be spelled out in sublayers later.

MR. JIM DELGAGO: It would be a case by case thing.

MR. RICHARD ANDERSON: It's not here. Nobody would take this by itself and say, "This is all we need," and run ahead and do a project.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Stephen.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: I think in some cases, the most safe and secure measures should be avoided. You know, perhaps in the greatest interests of safety, enlarged openings would cut a hole through the vessel. So, safety and security are not always the primary considerations. They have to be balanced.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: I agree with that. I think if you add those words in there, you are giving too much emphasis to them. If you control use, you should be able to control some of those safety things. Even though in many places, legally, regardless of use, you'd have to supply them, you'd still want to avoid it since this is a museum ship.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Dorian.

MR. DORIAN TRAVERS: Could we do it this

way -- "Alterations excepting those for safety and security that have no historical basis relative to that period should be discouraged"?

MR. DAVID BRINK: I think you have the same --

MR. KARL KORTUM: Let's not.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Peter.

MR. PETER STEELE: I think you can discourage them. You can sometimes find ways of preventing them without making alterations, or minimizing safety hazards without making alterations. And that is the point of it.

So, I would agree with those who are saying that to introduce safety, for instance, is putting too much emphasis on it.

FROM THE FLOOR: I was going to say a similar thing. If you are putting those words in there as a guideline, this tells us what we want to avoid, what we want to try and accomplish. If we are going to put safety or restaurants or any other kind of qualifiers on there -- the people that wanted yesterday to go see the hold and the engine room in the Jeremiah O'Brien really had to climb down a ladder. If they want to put an escalator down there to make it more convenient, that would fit in there as a qualifier. But we are trying to avoid that thing, and it's going to affect

all the other definitions that we have gone through the previous page, including interpretation, if we change that.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think, on the basis of what I have heard, I'd like to change my mind and go back to the idea of leaving it as written.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Do we have consensus on leaving it as written?

MR. JIM DELGADO: Yes.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Richard.

MR. RICHARD ANDERSON: Point of clarification. When you wanted to change "shall" to "should," is it in the second or first sentence in that? Want to say all vessels "should" be recognized as a product or "shall"?

MR. GARY HUME: Would you give us the right to go through this and try to figure out which it should be? Because it appears a lot of times.

MR. DAVID BRINK: We have consensus, then, that we are going to leave it as is? All right.

No. 4.

"Changes which have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a vessel. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected."

Consensus? All right. No. 5.

"Distinctive features or examples of craftsmanship which characterize a vessel -- its construction, operation, and cultural context -- shall be treated with sensitivity."

MR. KARL KORTUM: What does that mean? Without spending too much time on it.

MR. RANDY BIALLAS: You don't put a ship on land.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: It's not an avoidance. It's just saying: Let's treat them sensitively. And there are going to be exceptions. It's a case by case thing.

MR. TOM McGRATH: You can tell when somebody --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Excuse me. Who are you?

[Laughter and applause]

MR. TOM McGRATH: I am a ranger. You can tell somebody has done a good job and a bad job. We have seen a demonstration of that.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Further comment?

MR. KARL KORTUM: Here is a ship now. What are we talking about, leaving an area and showing adze marks? We do that anyway. That is my only point.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: No, we don't always do

that ordinarily. I think what we are saying here is that there are going to be those cases, Karl, where those adze marks, the builder's mistakes, the evidences of extraordinary finishing work and added-in frame ends or something -- those perhaps are important, and, in those cases, will treat that sensitively. And it's, again, a general thing. It's not a prohibition against or a strong --

MR. KARL KORTUM: On a purely -- I am supply curious about what we are trying to achieve in No. 5.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I think my understanding of it is that there are some aspects -- we are not talking about the whole vessel, but some aspects of it. And maybe it's a redundant question. Karl's point may be valid. Dorian.

MR. DORIAN TRAVERS: Could it be amended to read: "Shall be treated as historical"?

MR. HERMAN SUDHOLZ: "Sensitivity" is a good word.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Karl.

MR. KARL KORTUM: How about, if I may suggest, how about "distinctive features or areas of craftsmanship"?

MR. GARY HUME: No.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Don.

MR. DON BIRKHOLZ: One thing I see that this covers that the other items don't cover, and this gets back to a point you made to me several times, Karl, and that is, showing the wear and tear a vessel has undergone, the wear on the winch handles or on the sheaves -- anything that might impart the use of the vessel was in originally.

So, the effect of passage of time on a vessel, you know, marks of deterioration, so long as it's stabilized. I think if that doesn't have any historic value in terms of structure, but in terms of usage, -- I see that, the term "operation," as covering that. And I think that that would make No. 5 necessary here.

MR. KARL KORTUM: As you know, it's a keen point with me, and I think we ought to put in a couple words to that effect. Because it's not necessarily -- what you're describing is not in the craftsmanship department.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Distinctive features.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Wait just a moment.

MR. KARL KORTUM: We are talking about features having to do with a vessel's age that should not be wiped out with a piece of new plate or new piece of wood every time, however that should be worded.

MR. STEPHEN CANRIGHT: Another example might

be an interesting piece of graffiti on a bulkhead that you wouldn't want to paint over. I think there are a number of examples you have to recognize that that is significant. You have to deal with it sensitively. I think it makes sense --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Excuse me. I want to interrupt. It's now 5:00 o'clock. We are on No. 5. We need to get some consensus on this issue and move on.

Ted Miles.

MR. TED MILES: How about simply adding the words "passage of time" that somebody used. "Distinctive features relating to the passage of time" or because of --

FROM THE FLOOR: Distinctive historic features.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Let's raise our hands.

MS. GLENNIE WALL: I think maybe one good example, one distinctive feature about the Balclutha is her masts. The crew feels very strongly about not hanging a half sail that says "Welcome aboard" or advertises her from the yards, because it is not treating them sensitively.

MR. KARL KORTUM: That was used in the clipper ship Flying Cloud.

MR. JIM DELGADO: This is not the time to discuss historic precedents --

MR. KARL KORTUM: To save time, may I suggest, picking up from Ted Miles, "its construction operation" -- "age." Put the word "age" in there.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Or "passage of time." Just add that and a comma.

MR. DAVID BRINK: "Age."

FROM THE FLOOR: "Age."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Stephen.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can I make a recommendation, that we delete "with sensitivity" and add "as a significant." Doesn't that clarify the issue?

MR. STEVE HYMAN: No.

MR. DAVID WALKER: May we have a show of hands and then move on?

MR. DAVID BRINK: All right. All those that are for adding "age" -- is that the issue? All those that are against it. Consensus.

[Motion passed]

No. 6.

"All vessels shall be subject to a program of preventative maintenance. Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event that replacement is necessary, the new

material shall be replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other qualities that retain the historic character of the vessel. Repair or replacement of missing features shall be based on accurate duplications, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence."

Suds.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: First sentence, no problem. "In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material shall be replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other qualities that retain the historic character of the vessel."

What about laminates instead of, you know --

MR. DAVID BRINK: It's wherever possible.

MR. HERMAN SUDSHOLTZER: I think we say "wherever possible" in the first sentence. We don't in the second one.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think that it would be a good addition to say: In the event that replacement is necessary, wherever possible, the new material should be replaced.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Good. Everyone agree? No. 7.

"Every reasonable effort shall be made to document, protect, and preserve archaeological

resources affected by the management of the vessel."

MR. JAMES DELGADO: David, come on. Explain to me again why we have gone back to archeological resource. You said there was a good reason.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Peter Neill, is that your point?

MR. PETER NEILL: The fact is that archeologists will interpret that phrase in a very narrow way. And we are not going to get -- we shouldn't allow the issue to be confused by that.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Archeology, as John Moaunis said earlier, implies a scientific recovery of information, and that is not always going to be the case. What we are talking here is physical evidence, and we suggested physical evidence before.

MR. PETER NEILL: Physical evidence of what? The life of the ship or something like that?

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Yes. I find that far better, because not only are we in the archeological community going to look at that in a narrow fashion, it's going to be a lot of people, because archeology implies something entirely different. And it's physical evidence that we are talking about here.

MR. KARL KORTUM: Dorian Travers suggested the word "artifactual" for "archaeological."

MR. JOHN CONWAY: How do you feel about the ship that was raised from the Great Lakes that --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Let's not get into it.

MR. JOHN CONWAY: But, I mean, it's an archeological artifact, right? That ship was raised, and they tried to preserve it.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: Yes. But what we are talking about here is not that. What we are talking about is looking at a vessel such as Elissa and noting physical evidence of some feature that is no longer there. Physical evidence is the term.

MR. DAVID WALKER: Why don't you say "physical evidence"?

MR. JIM DELGADO: That is what I am saying. Let's say "physical evidence."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Bill Dulman.

MR. WILSON DULMAN: I move that we substitute the word "physical evidence" for "archaeological resources" and take a vote.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Raise your hands if you believe in "physical evidence." It's done. No. 8.

"Alterations shall be undertaken only when such changes do not seriously impact the historic character or significance of a vessel. Wherever possible, such alterations shall be done in a manner

that, if such alteration is removed, the essential form and integrity of the vessel will be preserved."

That is exactly what we said before.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I know in the interest of time, time is short, and I don't want to sound picky, but in the interest in preservation of the language, I would like to suggest that we say "do not have a serious impact," instead of using Alexander Haig's interpretation of the language, always making verbs out of nouns.

MR. GARY HUME: Fine.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Agreed?

MR. STEVE HYMAN: Could you say that again?

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Okay. I think it might be better English if we said, "Alterations shall be undertaken only when such changes do not have a serious impact on the historic character."

MR. DAVID BRINK: Does everyone agree? Done. No. 9. We did it.

"All preservation efforts shall be preceded by an established management plan" -- which is meant to include budgets, et cetera -- "which affirms and sustains the intended use of the vessel."

MR. JAMES DELGADO: That is preselection.

MR. KARL KORTUM: I would suggest "if

possible" be added to that.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Bill Dulman.

MR. WILSON DULMAN: I would suggest that this is one of the points that emphasizes the need to look at the shall's and should's, and in most cases they're going to need to be should's.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Okay. Any other comments? Yes.

MR. DAVID HULL: I'd like to suggest that in documentation --

MR. DAVID BRINK: Excuse me. We are on this point. I want to stay on this point.

Yes, John.

MR. JOHN CONWAY: Whose intended use? The builder, the original owner, or the last owner, or the museum?

MR. DAVID BRINK: It's the intended use of the vessel as it's determined by the plan. As someone said, this is the period of time we are taking the vessel to and this is how we are going to use it. All we are saying is, if at all possible, have a plan -- just don't start willy-nilly.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Excuse me, David. The way it's worded, it seems that if you had someone who had

an intended use for a vessel that was not necesarily the best use for the vessel, what you are saying here is that you are rubber-stamping that intended use.

If it affirms and sustains an intended use of a vessel, if somebody's intended use of the vessel is to cut it down to a barge when it's a full rigged vessel, you're writing a plan that rubber-stamps that.

MR. DAVID BRINK: I believe that the point was to relate the end use of the vessel.

MR. JIM DELGADO: I understand the point. I don't think it's stated here.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Don.

MR. DON BIRKHOLZ: I just wanted to state that this is coming at the end of all of the recommendations, guidelines here. And it should be understood that this plan should support these guidelines. It's No. 9 of 9.

MR. GARY HUME: What you are saying would be covered by No. 1.

MR. JAMES DELGADO: I guess I am just afraid of what happens if somebody just pulls No. 9 out and quotes that.

MR. DAVID BRINK: How about if we used the "end use of the vessel." Does that help? Walter.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: I think we could cover both

the confusion that John brought up and the concern that Jim has if, even though it sounds a little redundant, just say: "All preservation efforts shall be established which affirms and sustains the future intended use of the vessel in compliance with the foregoing guidelines."

MR. KARL KORTUM: There are many -- I want to make a point. There are many a restoration that has to start running the minute the title is secured to the old vessel because money is running out. And there isn't time to sit down and work out a plan, but good people are in charge and know what they're doing, and so they get started. And if a plan can come along a month or two later, fine.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Excuse me. Order, please. Walter has made a suggestion. Let's have a vote on it.

Walter, restate it, please.

MR. WALTER RYBKA: Before I restate it, I don't think it's fair not to answer Karl. And I think, Karl, I think if we have a "should be preceded," I think that would cover it. So, we say "All preservation efforts should be preceded" --

MR. JIM DELGADO: I don't think that is responsible. Sorry. I don't think that is responsible.

MR. MARK TANAKA-SANDERS: A plan and a guideline is to tell you how to get to the steps of making a plan, tell what you are going to do. And it's to tell how to get to the plan, which is your decision-making process. Your plan may be on the back of an envelope. It may be a government document 9,000 pages long. But if you don't have that plan to proceed and know where you are going, and if you are using taxpayers' money, you've got to be able to justify where you're spending it and why.

MR. DAVID BRINK: Anybody's money.

MR. MARK TANAKA-SANDERS: Some kind of plan needs to be done, whether it's on an envelope or it's in a volume.

MR. DAVID BRINK: John.

MR. JOHN WIZNUK: All work should be preceded by an established plan. Preservation starts when you think about getting a vessel. When you see this old vessel, you want to get it, want to preserve it and conserve it. All work proceeds by a plan.

MR. PETER NEILL: The whole reason we are going through this whole process is to arrive at that vast document. Too many mistakes have been made because the money was running out or in the name of the urgency of time.

as stated. All those in favor of the issue as stated? All those opposed?

[Motion passed]

MODERATOR McGRATH: Thank you very much.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Shall we vote on whether we accept the whole thing?

MR. DAVID BRINK: This is important. Do we have consensus on the overall document at this point? May we have a show of hands -- as a preliminary draft to be distributed, et cetera. It is a beginning point.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 o'clock p.m.]

---o0o---

as stated. All those in favor of the issue as stated? All those opposed?

[Motion passed]

MODERATOR McGRATH: Thank you very much.

MR. JIM DELGADO: Shall we vote on whether we accept the whole thing?

MR. DAVID BRINK: This is important. Do we have consensus on the overall document at this point? May we have a show of hands -- as a preliminary draft to be distributed, et cetera. It is a beginning point.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 o'clock p.m.]

---o0o---